

THE
BUCKLER
OF THE FAITH:

OR,
A DEFENCE OF THE
CONFESSION OF FAITH OF THE
reformed Churches in France, against the Ob-
jections of M. Arnonx the Iesuite.

Wherein all the principall Controuersies betweene
the reformed Churches and the Church of Rome
are decided.

Written in French by *Peter du Moulin* Minister of the word
of God in Paris: and now translated into English.

The second Edition.



LONDON,
Printed by Richard Field for Nathanael
Newbery. 1623.

BODL. LIBR.
14 OCT 1919
OXFORD



TO THE HIGH
AND MOST ILLVS-
TRIOUS PRINCE CHARLES,

PRINCE OF WALES, DVKE OF

Cornewall, Earle of Chester, &c. Sonne and heire

to the most high and mightie King IAMES,

King of Great Brittain, &c.



*Most Excellent Prince, I lay at
your Highnes feet this Buckler
of the faith, wherein the com-
bats and conflicts of error and
truth are lively set forth: Hum-
bly beseeching your Highnesse,
that as I haue made it for the defence of that cause
which your Highnesse maintaineth: so it may be
upheld by your Princely authoritie. Your vertue
which exceeds your yeares, maketh you a fit Iudge
of these matters; and your princely affabilitie
(whereof I haue had experience) encourageth me
to haue access vnto you. Besides, I could not better
adorne & beaurise the frontispice of this my work,
then by prefixing to it the name of so great a Prince.*

who being now nursed by the Church; shall one day
 be a nursing Father thereof: who hauing sucked
 Pietie from his mothers breasts, and following the
 steps of his Royall father, to frame himselfe to
 vertue, hath no need of any other examples then do-
 mesticall; Being the sonne of a great Prince, whose
 actions are rules, and his words wise instructions;
 Whose zeale not being confined within the limits
 of his owne Kingdomes, produceth noble effects in
 ferreine countries. From whose mouth (most noble
 Prince) you haue learned, how difficult a matter
 it is to Command: How he whom God hath fauoured
 and aduanced aboue all, hath so much the greater
 account to render vnto him: How it is a thing wor-
 thy double commendation in a Prince, to obey the will
 of God, because he hath more meanes to fulfill his
 owne: How hard a thing it is to procure to so many
 persons rest by his trauell, and secure repose by his
 vigilancie: How necessarie it is for him to haue a-
 bout him vertuous persons, whose eyes and eares he
 may make vse of, lest peraduenture otherwise he
 come last to know the truth: How carefully he ought
 to guide his actions, sith they are exposed to the
 view of so many millions, and subiect to euery ones
 construction: How his Wisedome ought to be armed
 with Courage, because a vertuous Prince must make
 account.

DEDICATORIE.

account to haue the diuell his enemye. These holy Instructions (most noble Prince) which are familiar vnto you together with the gifts of nature, where-with God hath abundantly adorned you, call you to great matters, and promise great effects, and fill with great hopes the hearts of all those that feare God: Who esteeme you as a plant which God hath planted, which he dresseth with his owne hand, which he watereth with his grace, and will one day make fructifie to his glorie. For my part sith I can adde nothing to your praise, I will offer my vowes to God for your prosperitie: hoping that your Highnesse will fauourably accept of my affection, and esteeme me to be your Hignesse

most humble and most
obedient seruant,

Peter du Moulin.



An Aduertisement to the Reader.



*Christian Reader, may it please thee to understand, that when two sundry Editions of this worke had speedily bene set forth in French, the Author was aduertized that some in the Church of England disliked somewhat in it; whereupon he reuiued it all againe, purposing to explaine himselfe in that manner in the next Edition, as should giue full satisfaction. But before that could conueniently be set forth, hauing notice of my intention to publish his worke in English, he sent me the copie, wherein some things he omitted, a few passages he somewhat altered with his owne pen. In one place he inserted two whole leaues, viz. in the 124. * Section; wherein at large he setteth downe his iudgement touching Episcopall authoritie, and the discipline of the Church of England. Thus much I thought to acquaint thee withall beforehand, that thou mightest not giue lesse credit to this English copie, though it somewhat vary from the French already published; for nothing is herein added, omitted, or altered, but by direction from the Author himselfe, who hath promised that the next French Edition shall be set forth with the like corrections and additions. In the meane while enjoy this, and accept it with the same mind with which it is tendered vnto thee. Farewell.*

* Pag. 345.
beginning at
line 20. and
continuing
vnto pag. 348.

THE



THE PREFACE TO THOSE OF THE CHVRCH OF ROME.



SIRS, that which I intend at this time to offer vnto you, it may be, would be better accepted if it were rendered vnto you by another hand: howbeit I dare boldly affirme, that neuer any spake vnto you, that was either more voide of hatred, or more desirous of your good and saluation. The word of God, whereupon we ground our Religion, commandeth vs to loue those that hate vs; and to beleue that those which haue persecuted vs, haue thought that in so doing they haue done God good seruice. Every man that seeketh the truth, ought to be thus affected, without which it is impossible to reape any fruite by our communication: for no wound will euer be healed, as long as the inflammation continues. And as in an house that burneth, those that speake are not vnderstood, by reason of the noise and cries of those that gather about it: so we shall neuer vnderstand one the other, as long as our minds are inflamed with hatred and rancour. The studie of sacred truth requireth a peaceable spirit, which deliberately weigheth things, without carping at the persons. For what reason haue we to hate any

The Preface, to those

man because he erreth, or because we thinke we see clearer then he doth?

Now as blind men commonly are mutinous and cholericke, so those men are most violent that haue least vnderstanding: so that he that will take vpon him to remedie this ignorance, must seeke to pacifie their rage. But there is no hope of remedie in him who studieth to be ignorant, and feareth to know the will of God, lest he should be obliged to follow it. Such is the maladie of this age, wherein the people make profession to follow without knowledge; and to belecue the Church, not knowing what the Church ought to beleue: and relie vpon the faith of another, not knowing the rule of faith, which is the word of God. As if those that are our pastors and guides ought to be our warrant before the iudgement seate of God, or as if it were a vertue to beleue in God by an atturney.

It is true indeed that the people ought to obey their guides, provided God be their guide, and to beleue that which they teach; so that which they teach be drawne from the word of God. The which if they hide from the people, and hinder them from the reading thereof, it is an euident signe either that they feele themselves culpable, or that in stead of submitting themselves vnto this rule, they would haue their authority to be the supreme rule. For why should the word of God contained in the holy Scriptures, be suspected by vs to be a dangerous booke? Why should children be forbidden to looke into their fathers testament? Saint

*Index Librorū
prohibitorum
cum regulis
confectis per
patres à Tri-
dentina Syno-
do delectos.
Regula 4. Cū
experimento
manifestum
sit, si sacra
Biblia vulga-
ri lingua pos-
sim sine discrimine permittantur, plus inde ob hominum temeritatem detrimenti quàm utilitatis
oriri: Qui absque tali facultate ea legere seu habere præsumpserit, nisi prius Biblij ordinarij
iudicis, peccatorum absolutionem percipere non possit. Where you must note, that there it is
spoken of Bibles translated by Catholicke Romane authors.*

of the Church of Rome.

Paul the Apostle wrote his Epistles to the people of Rome, Corinth, and Ephesus, to the end that they might reade them: why then should Christians in these dayes be deprived of the reading of them? The Catholicke Epistles of Saint *James*, Saint *Peter*, and Saint *John*, are written to all the faithfull in generall: why then should not Christian people reade those letters that are expressly addressed vnto them, and written for their instruction? Why should not a Christian reade the writings of the Prophets as well as they of Bercea did, who hauing bene at Saint *Pauls* preaching, went and conferred his doctrine with the Scriptures? To what end is it to alledge places of the holy Scriptures in our Sermons, if the auditorie be not permitted to examine whether they haue bene faithfully and truly alledged? It is a most horrible thing, that in those countries where the Inquisition reigneth, it should be a crime deservng burning, to haue a Bible in the vulgar tongue, and in the meane time not onely the reading of friuolous fables is tollerated, but whoredome also by the law and publicke authoritie is established and permitted. And if it be the translation that displeaseth his Holinesse, at least he ought to take order that there should be one done according to his mind.

To say that some men abuse the reading thereof, is as much as to accuse the Apostles of want of discretion, for hauing written their Epistles to Christian people, without foreseeing that they might abuse them. By the same reason preaching likewise should be prohibited, because manie abuse it. Men abuse euen the bountie and goodnesse of God. And if we must haue speciall leaue to reade the holy Scriptures, is it not a miserable case,

The Preface, to those

case, that we may not obey God without licence? and that God can haue no seruants without the Pope of Romes permission? Or if they say, that it is not conuenient nor fit that ignorant people should reade them; I answer, that all men are ignorant in religion before they haue read them; and that, without impietie, a man cannot haue knowledge in religion without the Scriptures.

Esay 5. 13.

Math. 22. 29.

Habac. 2. 4.

Math. 15. 14.

Therefore let me intreate you to shake off this scrupulositie, whereby God is wronged: as if his word were contagious, and a net spread abroad to intangle the consciences of weake Christians; lest that prophetic be accomplished in you which is pronounced by the Prophet *Esay*, saying, *Therefore my people are gone into captivity, because they haue no knowledge*; and that saying of our Sauour Christ, *Ye are deceived, not knowing the Scriptures*. Suffer not this precious treasure, nor this contract of our spirituall marriage with the Sonne of God, to be pulled out of your hands. Suspect those who during the night of ignorance, hide this celestiall light, and in the meane time light and set vp candles at noone day. Neuer hope to be saued by the faith of other men, for God faith, that *The iust shall liue by his faith*; and that *If the blind leade the blind, both shall fall into the ditch*.

Now to make you know, that the Scripture is taken away from you, not to keepe you within the bounds of sobrietie, but to detaine you in ignorance, consider that in the Church of Rome they reade certaine Chapters of the holy Scriptures openly vnto you in a language which you vnderstand not. If in those Chapters men spake vnto God, it might for an excuse be alledged, that God vnderstandeth all languages: but those

of the Church of Rome.

those Chapters are diuine instructions, wherein God speaketh vnto men. Tell me in conscience, why should God be as it were a barbarian vnto vs, speaking vnto vs in an vnknowne tongue? Why doth he speake vnto men, but because he would haue them to vnderstand him? Why are those things which otherwise would be held to be ridiculous & contrary to common sense, in religion esteemed to be good and conuenient? Is it not rather an intention of the enemy of our saluation, by that meanes to expose Christianitie to an open scorne, and to hinder the word of God from being vnderstood by vs? to the end also that the threatning pronounced by God vnto those people with whom he is angry, might be accomplished, saying, *By men of other languages will I speake vnto this people, and yet will they not heare me.* 1. Cor. 14. 21.

This mischiefe hath produced another; for in taking the holy Scriptures from you, which is the booke that maketh men wise, they haue given you images, which are termed the bookes of the ignorant, because by them ignorance is maintained. By them the people is amused, in stead of being taught the truth. In stead of instruction, they giue them recreation. But because the second commandement of the law of God is against it, which concerning the seruice of God, forbiddeth vs to make any grauen images, and to worship or fall downe before any thing that is in heauen aboue, or in the earth beneath: and that this law pronounced with thunder and lightening, thundereth yet against this superstition, these Doctours haue imposed silence to the Law of God, and haue bene so bold as to raze this commandement out of the Houres of the Virgin *Mariæ*, and Seruice bookes which they
giue

The Preface, to those

giue you leaue to reade: which makes vs wholly to suspect them. And it is a thing hardly to be thought or beleueed, that poore little wormes of the earth dare be so bold, as to correct that Law which God pronounced with his owne mouth: yea the same Law whereby at the latter day they shall be iudged.

For these practises the holy and sacred name of the Church serueth for a couer. They say, that the Church cannot erre: that she is the soueraigne Iudge of the points and doubts of faith: and that she is an infallible interpreter of the Scriptures. By which Church, they vnderstand neither the Grecian, Syrian, nor African, (although much ancients & purer then the Romane,) but onely the Romane Church: which hauing neuer bene other then a particular Church, is said to be the vniuersall Church; and by this meanes the Church of Rome is become a iudge in her owne cause. The Greek Church (much ancients then the Romane) complaineth that the Church of Rome hath reuolted and separated it selfe from her, producing against her, her chaires, her succession, and her antiquitie. In this controuersie the Church of Rome boasteth to be Iudge, and so will be both Iudge and partie. And in the question, whether the Church of Rome cannot erre, she her selfe will be Iudge: and which is more, when question is made to decide what the dutie of the Church is, the Church of Rome will be the soueraigne Iudge, that she may haue no other law then that which she will establish, and which she propoundeth to her selfe. And when any argument is moued concerning the sence and interpretation of the Law of God, she saith she is the infallible interpreter thereof, and will haue her interpretations to be held to be of equall authority
with

with the Law of God. And yet it is certaine, that at the latter day, he shall be iudged by that Law. There is no absurditie more palpable, then to make sinfull men, infallible iudges of the sence of that law by which their sins ought to be iudged. What obedience, thinke you, is the soueraigne Maister of all creatures to expect, if his seruants might presume to say vnto him, It is true that thou hast commanded vs to obserue such a law, but we interpret the same otherwise, and iudge that thy commandement ought thus to be vnderstood; and thou knowest that we are infallible iudges in such matters, and that our interpretations are of equall authoritie with thy commandement. After this manner it were better to be a seruant then a maister. By which of these two wayes, thinke you, ought the Prelates of the Church to be iudged at the latter day? whether by the Law of God, or by their owne interpretations? Herein I make all men iudges that haue any sparke of common sense, or any free iudgement without preiudicate opinion in them; whether God governing and teaching the Church by his word, or the Church which ought to receiue this word and yeeld obedience vnto him, ought rather to be soueraigne Iudge in religion? And which should rather be Iudge, either the Scripture that commands that there shall be a Church, and propounds and prescribes lawes thereunto, or the Church which onely testifieth the same to be the Scripture? specially seeing that this testimonie may be given by a corrupt and disobedient Church to the Scripture? Which shall rather be Iudge, the Scripture that is one, and which iudgeth without passion, or the Church which is diuided into diuers contrary Churches, which cannot be assembled together, and whereof the Pastors
are.

The Preface, to those

are subiect to be ambitious, and addicted to couetousnes, and that ought to be suspected Iudges, when they onely seeke their owne profit and authoritie?

Here I can easily, as it were with a finger, point out and shew vnto you, that you are led and guided in a way wherein it is impossible for you to be saued. For you are taught simply to beleue in the Church of Rome, and without other enquiry, wholly to depend vpon the authoritie thereof. And yet neuerthelesse, you are deprived of all meanes whereby to know and find out, whether this Church wherein you beleue is pure, and teacheth true doctrine. For how should you know it? is it by the holy Scriptures? but that booke you are not permitted to reade. At Rome and in Spaine, to reade it is burning. Will you know it by antiquitie? but they are Greeke and Latin bookes, which the people vnderstand not. What knowes an artificer, a woman, or labourer among you, whether his Church teacheth according to the Scriptures? or whether his Church be the same now that it was twelue or fiftene hundred yeares agoe? or whether in a great role of Popes set downe in a paper, the first of them beleeued as the latter do; and whether time hath wrought no alteration therein? To be short, you haue no other prooffe for the puritie of your Church, but onely the testimonie of your Church it selfe, the Prelates whereof boast that they cannot erre, and in the meane time they bereaue you of all meanes of discerning error from truth, by hiding from you the rule of truth, which is the holy Scriptures. But why should the Church of Rome rather haue this perfection, then the Greeke or Syrian Churches, farre ancienter and purer then the Church of Rome, founded by Iesus Christ
himselfe

of the Church of Rome.

himselfe and by his Apostles, and which also affirme that they haue Saint *Peters* chaire? Doth the Scripture attribute any prerogatiue aboue others to the Roman Church? or doth it giue her the priuiledge not to erre?

From all this, there followeth two things that are as cleare as the Sunne at noone day; the one, that your faith is grounded onely vpon the authoritie of men; and by consequence, that your religion is humane, and not diuine. Whosoever saith, I beleue the Gospell and the word of God, because the Church commandeth it, giueth more credit to the Church then to God. To doubt of Gods truth, is a lesse crime then to make it to depend vpon men. The other, that of all humane testimonies you ground vpon the worst and most vncertaine: for you beleue that your Church is good, because she saith so, and make her Iudge in her owne cause: not once considering, that by this word Church, you vnderstand not the Christian people, nor all Pastors in generall, but the Pope and a few Prelates, whose rules are called the Rules of the Church, although they tend wholly to the profit of the Clergie, and to aduance the Empire of the Bishop of Rome. And will you alwayes hold your soules, created by God according to his image, and which he hath redeemed by the blood of his Sonne, in this miserable captiuitie? Will you draw and heape the wrath and indignation of God vpon your heads, by reiecting the saluation which is offered vnto you?

I confesse that the Church of Rome in certaine points alledgeth the Scriptures; and that betweene vs and her there is great contention touching the interpretation thereof: but we vse the Scriptures in other manner.

The Preface, to those

manner than those that teach you.

1. For they feare lest the people should read the Scriptures, and we exhort them thereunto.

2. They perswade you that the Scriptures are obscure and ambiguous: but we say that all things necessarie to saluation are therein contained, and may be from thence clearly deduced.

3. They say, that the Scriptures are an imperfect rule, and will haue another vnwritten rule, and traditions of the Church, which they equall in authoritie with the Scriptures. We on the contrary say, that the holy Scriptures are able to make vs wise vnto saluation: and that we ought not to presume about that which is written: and that in those things which are cleare and manifest in the Scriptures and need no interpretation, all doctrines necessarie to saluation are contained.

4. Also when we alledge the Scriptures, we alledge them as the soueraigne Iudge, and as that which governeth the Church, and giues her her authoritie. But the Church of Rome alledgeth the Scriptures as a doctrine authorised by the Church, and saith, that we must receiue them because the Church hath so ordained it.

5. And when we interpret the Scriptures, we giue not our interpretations for lawes, as the Church of Rome doth, neither do we make our selues Iudges and infallible interpreters of the holy Scriptures.

6. Lastly, when we interpret the Scriptures, we draw our interpretations from the Scriptures themselves. But the Church of Rome drawes her interpretations from the vnwritten word and traditions. As for example, we expound these words, *This is my bodie*, by these words, *The bread which I giue you, is the true me-*

He tooke
bread & gaue
it. Do this in
remembrance
of me.

TO THE

TABLE

of the Church of Rome.

ration of my bodie; which exposition is found in the text it selfe, touching the institution of the Sacrament: or by these words of the Apostle, *The bread which we breake, is it not the communion of the bodie of Christ?* But your Doctōrs do not interpret the Scriptures for: for they draw their interpretations from the vnwritten word, and from Traditions. When the Lord said to *Peter*, *I haue prayed that thy faith may not faile*: they say that by those words the vertue not to erre was promised to Saint *Peter*, and to the Popes of Rome his successors. But the Scripture speaketh not of Popes, nor of Bishops of Rome, nor giueth any successor to Saint *Peter* in his Apostolicall place. In like sort there is mention in *Malachi* of a pure oblation that should be offered in all places. This oblation, according to the interpretations of the Romish Doctōrs, is the Masse, where in they say, that the body of our Lord is really sacrificed. But this interpretation is taken out of the vnwritten word: for the holy Scripture speaketh not of the Masse, neither commandeth vs to sacrifice the body of Iesus Christ, nor establisheth Priests in the Church to sacrifice the Sonne of God. And so when the Scripture saith, *Thou shalt worship one onely God, and him onely shalt thou serue*: the Romish Doctōrs interpret it, that God onely forbiddeth the adoration of *Lutia*, but not of *Dulia*, which is an inferiour religious seruice. But the Scriptures make no mention of the adoration of *Dulia*, nor of any other religious seruice, but onely of that which is due vnto God. These are interpretations which the Romish Church drawes from the vnwritten word, which is referred to the discretion of the Church of Rome, and cannot be learned but from her mouth. For I am of opinion, that neuer any man saw all the

The Preface, to those

manner than those that teach you.

1. For they feare lest the people should reade the Scriptures, and we exhort them thereunto.

2. They perswade you that the Scriptures are obscure and ambiguous: but we say that all things necessarie to saluation are therein contained, and may be from thence clearly deduced.

3. They say, that the Scriptures are an imperfect rule, and will haue another vniwritten rule, and traditions of the Church, which they equall in authoritie with the Scriptures. We on the contrary say, that the holy Scriptures are able to make vs wise vnto saluatiō: and that we ought not to presume aboue that which is written: and that in those things which are cleare and manifest in the Scriptures and need no interpretation, all doctrines necessarie to saluation are contained.

2. Tim. 3. 15.
1. Cor. 4. 6.

4. Also when we alledge the Scriptures, we alledge them as the soueraigne Iudge, and as that which governeth the Church, and giues her her authoritie. But the Church of Rome alledgeth the Scriptures as a doctrine authorisef by the Church, and saith, that we must receiue them because the Church hath so ordained it.

5. And when we interpret the Scriptures, we giue not our interpretations for lawes, as the Church of Rome doth, neither do we make our selues Iudges and infallible interpreters of the holy Scriptures.

6. Lastly, when we interpret the Scriptures, we draw our interpretations from the Scriptures themselves. But the Church of Rome drawes her interpretations from the vniwritten word and traditions. As for example, we expound these words, *This is my bodie*, by these words, *The bread which I giue you, is the euenmemo-*

He tooke
bread & gaue
it. Do this in
remembrance
of me.

ration

ration of my bodie; which exposition is found in the text it selfe, touching the institution of the Sacrament: or by these words of the Apostle; *The bread which we breake, is it not the communion of the bodie of Christ?* But your Doctors do not interpret the Scriptures so: for they draw their interpretations from the unwritten word, and from Traditions. When the Lord said to Peter, *I have prayed that thy faith may not faile*: they say that by those words the vertue not to erre was promised to Saint Peter, and to the Popes of Rome his successors. But the Scripture speaketh not of Popes, nor of Bishops of Rome; nor giueth any successor to Saint Peter in his Apostolicall place. In like sort there is mention in *Malachi* of a pure oblation that should be offered in all places. This oblation, according to the interpretations of the Romish Doctors, is the Masse, where in they say, that the body of our Lord is really sacrificed. But this interpretation is taken out of the unwritten word: for the holy Scripture speaketh not of the Masse, neither commandeth vs to sacrifice the body of Iesus Christ, nor establisheth Priests in the Church to sacrifice the Sonne of God. And so when the Scripture saith, *Thou shalt worship one onely God, and him onely shalt thou serue*: the Romish Doctors interpret it, that God onely forbiddeth the adoration of *Lutai*, but not of *Dulia*, which is an inferiour religious seruice. But the Scriptures make no mention of the adoration of *Dulia*, nor of any other religious seruice, but onely of that which is due vnto God. These are interpretations which the Romish Church drawes from the unwritten word, which is referred to the discretion of the Church of Rome, and cannot be learned but from her mouth. For I am of opinion, that neuer any man saw all the

The Preface, to these

*Sollar, in Bark
cap. 3. Non po-
tē de Ecclesia
Christi sentis,
qui nihil ad-
mittis, nisi
quod expresse
in veteri Ec-
clesia sum-
tum aut factū
esse legit: qua-
si Ecclesia po-
steriorū tem-
porū, aut defe-
rit esse Ecce-
sia, aut facul-
tatem non ha-
beat explican-
di, & docu-
randi, confir-
mandi, etiam
& iubendi,
qua ad fidem
& mores Chri-
stianorum
pertinent.*

doctrines of the vnwritten word drawne into one bo-
die, because that word altereth and changeth with
times and seasons, and is accommodated to the times,
and that still the Church of Rome hath power to adde
new articles therunto, and namely touching the points
of faith.

The greatest mischief is, that these traditions and
doctrines of the vnwritten word, are not onely addi-
tions to the Scriptures, but manifest contradictions:
whereof the Masse alone sheweth many examples.

1. For Iesus Christ administring the Sacrament of
the Eucharist, spake in a tongue vnderstood by the as-
sistants: but the Priest in the Masse speaks in a tongue
not vnderstood by the people.

2. Iesus Christ communicated to all the assistants:
but the Priest oftentimes eateth and drinketh alone.

3. Iesus Christ giueth the cup to all men, and will
haue all to drinke thereof: but the Priest drinks alone,
and denieth the cup to the people.

4. Iesus Christ offered nothing vnto God: but the
Priest in the Masse prayeth God to accept his oblation
of Christ.

5. Iesus Christ listeth vp no hoast: but the Priest list-
eth vp an hoast to be adored.

6. In the institution of this holy Sacrament, there is
no mention made of a sacrifice, nor to sacrifice the bo-
die of Iesus Christ: on the contrary, the Priest preten-
deth to sacrifice the body of Iesus Christ in a reall and
propitiatory sacrifice for the quicke and the dead.

7. In the institution of this Sacrament, there was no
adoration of the hoast, but all the Apostles sate at the
table: on the contrary, the Priest causeth the hoast to
be adored. He that at this day should do as the Apo-
stles,

stles did, should be held and esteemed to be prophane and an hereticke.

8. There were no relickes hidden vnder the Lords table, nor bones of any of the Patriarkes or Prophets: on the contrary, vnder the stones of the altar there are bones of the dead, without which relickes an altar cannot be consecrated; and the Priest in the Masse asketh mercie and forgiuenesse of his sinnes for the merites of the Saints, whose bones are hidden vnder the altar.

Oramus te Domine per merita Sanctorum quorum reliquia hic sunt, & omnium Sanctorum, ut indulgere digneris omnia peccata mea.

9. The Gospell witnesseth, that Iesus Christ giuing bread vnto his disciples, said, it was his body: on the contrary, the Priest saith, that the bread is not the body of Iesus Christ, but that the bread is transubstantiated into the body of Iesus Christ.

10. Iesus Christ witnesseth, that it was the fruite of the vine which he dranke: but the Priest denieth that it is the fruite of the vine.

11. Iesus Christ will haue vs to do it in remembrance of him: but the Priest pretendeth to make Christ himselfe.

12. Saint Paul in foure places saith, that we breake and eate bread: on the contrary, the Priest maintaineth that we neither breake nor eate bread.

13. The Lord instituted a Sacrament, but the Priest celebrateth a sacrifice. In a word, the one celebrated the holy Supper, the other singeth Masse, expressly made to disfigure the holy Supper of the Lord.

The Romish Doctors thinke to defend their cause by vsing a childish reccrimination, and obiecting against vs, that seeing we will needs follow our Lord Iesus Christ, we ought to celebrate the holy Sacrament after supper, & in a high chamber, and admit no women vnto it. But neither the place, nor the houre, nor the sexes

The Preface, to those

of the assistants, are of the essence or any part of the action; and without them the action is still entire: and therein Iesus Christ neither prescribed any rule, nor made any prohibition. But the change and alteration which we object against them, is in essentiall things, and such as change the nature of the action: seeing that thereby an adoration is induced, which was neuer commanded, nor yet practised by the Apostles: a sacrifice established which the Lord did not appoint: a superstition touching dead mens bones authorized: a common repast changed into a priuate Masse: and the people deprived of the vnderstanding of the ordinary Seruice; taught to take God in their hands, to eate their Creator, to adore the Creature, and are deprived of halfe the Sacrament, that is, of the cup, whereof Christ said, *Drinke ye all of this*; as the Apostle also commandeth the people of Corinth to take the cup as well as the bread. Wherein we propound a way and meanes for vs to agree one with another, which cannot be refused but by him that loueth discord, that hath no Christian bloud in him, or that striueth against God. For euery Christian confesseth, that Iesus Christ did well, and that there is no exception to be taken against his institution. And although it were lawfull to celebrate the Supper in oster manner then he did it, yet all men grant, that it should not be ill done to follow his example, to speake as he spake, and to do as he did. This is it that we require. And it is certaine, that the Pope might end all the controversies growne and raised vpon this point, which trouble and make a diuision in Christendome, if he would reduce the holy Supper into the forme wherein the Lord did celebrate it; laying aside all disputations, and bind the people to the example

1. Cor. 11. 8.
Let a man
examine him
selfe, and so
eate of this
bread and
drinke of this
cup.

of the Sonne of God. What discommodities or inconveniences soever might be alledged to the contrary, they cannot equalize nor counterballance the obedience that we owe vnto Iesus Christ, the peace of Christendome, nor the revnion of this rupture and separation of the people, which hath bene the cause of so many troubles, and hath shed so much blood, and which openeth the sides of the Church of Rome, as well as it doth ours, exposing the same to the violence of Turkes and Infidels.

All indifferent persons will easily confesse and acknowledge that this is truth; but fearing that your consciences should be touched therewith, they vse an artificiall meanes to represent our religion vnto you in other manner then it is, and paint it out before you like a terrible monster, making vs to speake and teach those things which are altogether contrarie to our beleefe and confession: and withall, diuers of you are so light of credit, and so easily caried away, that you rather desire to learne and vnderstand what our religion is by the inuectiues of our enemies, then by our owne confession. And although we haue protested, that we beleue nothing of all that which they impose vpon vs, yet they will constantly perswade vs, that we beleue that which we beleue not. Wherein against their wils they iustifie vs. For thereby they secretly confesse, that our religion being truly set downe, cannot be repressed: and that if it were liuely described, it would at the first make a strong impression in the spirits and hearts of the auditors by the euidence of the truth thereof. They tell you,

Ver. That our religion teacheth, that good works are not necessary.

The Preface, to those

2. That the elect may commit sinne, and liue wickedly without danger.

3. That God rewardeth not good workes.

4. That God constraineth our wils, and forcibly draweth them to goodnesse.

5. That we accuse and blame God to be vniust, as hauing propounded a Law vnto vs which we cannot fulfill.

6. That we are enemies to the Saints and to the virgin *Marie*.

7. That to vnderstand the Scriptures, euery one of vs boasteth that we haue a particular inspiration giuen vnto vs.

8. And that we deny the omnipotent power of God in the Eucharist.

All this is false, and contrary to our beleefe.

1. Our religion teacheth, that good workes are necessary to saluation. For men go not into heauen by the way of hell, nor to the kingdome of God by seruing the diuell.

2. Our religion teacheth, that those that are predestinated to saluation, are also predestinated to liue holy. To say, I may boldly liue wickedly because I am predestinated to saluation, is the speech of a reprobate, that will be wicked because God is good, and that maketh Gods grace, which is a prouocation and a goade to pricke vs forward to vertue, a pillow to lull him a sleepe in vice.

3. Our religion beleueth, that God rewardeth good workes, but of his free mercie, without desert.

4. It beleueth that God constraineth not mens wils, but boweth them, and causeth them willingly to addiect their minds to goodnesse.

5. It

5. It doth not esteeme it a thing vniust, that God requireth that of man which he cannot do, when man is bound to do it, and that his weaknesse or want of abilitie proceedeth from himselfe:

6. It honoureth the Saints, as the same Saints did honour those Saints that were before them.

7. For the vnderstanding of the Scriptures, it contenteth it selfe with that which therein is clearely and evidently set downe; and leaueth particular inspirations to mad and fantasticall persons.

8. It denieth not the omnipotent power of God in the Eucharist, but ruleth it selfe according to his will. It vseth the holy Sacrament, not to make Iesus Christ, but to honour him; not to make his body to descend downe vnto vs, but to eleuate and lift vp our hearts vnto him. It taketh not vpon her to take God in this life, but is content that God would be pleased to take vs vp into heauen when we die. She is not afraid that God can fall, be stolen, caried away by a mouse, or eaten by his enemies. She beleeueth not that the Sonne of God and the diuell both entred into *Iudas* together at one time; nor that Iesu: Christ did eate himselfe, seeing it was not necessary for our redemption.

Our religion is a religion that acknowledgeth no other head of the Church but Iesus Christ, no other rule of faith then his word, no propitiatory sacrifice but his death, no other purgatory but his blood, nor other merits but his obedience.

It is a religion that will haue the people to reade the word of God, because she is not afraid that men therein shall find their condemnation; which speaketh in a knowne language, because she is not ashamed of her beleefe.

The Preface, to those

Galat. 6. 5.

It is a religion which teacheth fasting to consist in abstinence from meate, and not in distinction of meates. She fasteth for exercise of humilitie, and not with opinion of merite or satisfaction: she borroweth not other mens satisfactions, but with the Apostle beleueth, that euery man shall beare his owne burthen.

It is a religion, which distrusteth in her owne works, trusteth in the promises of God: which preacheth hope and assurance, and not to doubt of her saluation: which recommendeth an humble assurance, and not an arrogant perplexitie, by the which those that display or boast of their owne merits, make profession to doubt of their saluation.

It is a religion, wherein men confesse and acknowledge that they haue often done that which God forbiddeth to be done, farre from hauing done more then he commandeth to be done: and is so farre from doing superabundant works, that it faileth in doing that which is necessary to be done. It pretendeth not to make God debtor to man by works of supererogation, but confesseth man to be a sinner before God, because of his disobedience.

It is a religion, which in stead of framing and fashioning stones like vnto the image of man, seeketh by all meanes possible to reforme man according to the image of God: which in stead of worshipping a crosse of wood, adoreth Christ crucified, trusteth in his passion, and glorieth in his ignominie.

It is a religion, which beleueth not that God which gaue his Sonne to die to saue his enemies, taketh pleasure to torment the soules of his children in a fire of Purgatory, and to punish them for sinnes alreadie pardoned,

of the Church of Rome.

doned, and for the which Iesus Christ hath made full satisfaction, by punishments which serue not to amend the sinner, but to satisfie the iustice of God.

It is a religion which maketh not her prayers by number, neither maketh the efficacie of prayer to consist in the often repetition of the same prayer, but in faith and the disposition of the heart.

It is a religion which holdeth that faith consisteth not in ignorance, but in knowledge: which equally administred holy things as well to the rich as to the poore; not as in the Romish Church, where dispensations and absolutions are sold, and particular Masses are neuer said but for them that first giue something to the Priest.

To be short, it is a religion which hath little outward shew and glory, but much inward comfort, constancie and perseuerance, which will be knowne by the effects, and ordaineth few ceremonies, but ministred many instructions.

You make answer to this, and say, that these are new things. How esteeme you them to be new, seeing that Iesus Christ himselfe & his Apostles taught in that manner? It is true, that they are new to those that are nourished in an inueterate error. Healing is neuer then the disease: but we must alwayes ascend vp to the spring of truth, in regard whereof all old errors are new. No man euer opposed himselfe against an accustomed rooted error, but he was accused of noueltie. But this reproch of noueltie ill becometh the mouthes of those persons which hide the true antiquitie from the people, which is the word of God, and which maintaine, that yet at this day the Church may & can make new ordinances touching faith; and which by the Church vnderstand no other

The Preface, to those

other then the Romish Church; that in the first ages after the Apostles cannot produce one man that was of their religion; and which know that in all antiquitie there is no mention made of excluding the people from the Cup, of prohibiting them the reading of the holy Scriptures, of reading the Scriptures to the people in a language which they vnderstand not, of painting the Trinitie, of worshipping Images, of adoring the host with the worship of *Latria*, of private Masses, of the Bishop of Romes Court, of his Indulgences, of the treasure of the Church, of his power to depose Kings, and of drawing soules out of Purgatorie, nor of many other corruptions which are beautified and set forth with the fraudulent title of Apostolicall traditions, as if they came from the Apostles themselves.

Those same men that boast and brag of Antiquitie, are they that rudely handle the ancient Doctors, and censure and condemne them at their pleasure: that will haue the Fathers to be interpreters of the Scriptures, so that they themselves may be interpreters of the Fathers, and iudges of Antiquitie: and that not onely condemne euery particular Father, but also whole Councils wherein the Fathers generally spake all together. Three vniuersall Councils condemned *Honorius* Bishop of Rome to be an hereticke, but at this day they reiect those Councils. At the first Council of Constantinople, *anno* 381. there was 150. orthodoxe Bishops, and 630. at the Council of Chalcedon holden *anno* 451. and yet neither that great number, nor the great antiquitie hindreth our aduersaries from condemning all those Fathers for making the Bishop of Constantinople equal with the Bishop of Rome in Ecclesiasticall

it is a
false saying
misc. they
are not
excluded from
the cup

Cotton in the Preface of his Cath. Institut. speaketh thus of those two vniuersall Councils, saying, Grecia began *an.* 380. to draw on to rebellion against the holy seate, & to traueise the authoritie

of the Church of Rome.

clesiasticall things, The Councell of Constance holden anno 1416. acknowledgeth that in the primitive Church the faithfull received the Sacrament vnder both kinds, and neuerthelesse ordaineth that those that would follow the ancient custome, should be holden and esteemed to be heretickes, and grievously punished.

of the Bishop of Rome, appointing the Bishop of Constanti-
nople to be his equall.
After that, an. 450. they said, that they had the same priuiledges.

And it is a wonder how these men dare speake of Councils, when they know very well, that day is not more contrary to night, then ancient Councils are contrary to the new, wherein the Pope rulerh all, and ordaineth all, the other Bishops onely giuing their consents, by bowing their heads in signe of approbation; at the entring into which Councils, the holy Bible is laid at the Popes feet, to witnesse that the word of God is subiect vnto him; where the Pope is set in an high throne, and the Emperour below at his feet. To be short, we see by the practises of the latter Councils, specially the Councell of Florence, the last of Lateran, and by the booke of sacred Ceremonies, that a Council for certaine ages past, is nothing else but a Papall Consistorie, but held with more solemnitie: whereas in the ancient Councils the Bishop of Rome durst not personally appeare, and his ordinary Deputies therein had neither presidencie nor authoritie: which is farre from ordaining, *that no booke shall be Canonically without the Popes authoritie; and that all Kings must kisse his feet:* and to declare, *that there is no other name vnder the heauens, but that of the Pope:* which are the decrees and ordinances of the Councell of Rome vnder Gregory the seuenth, anno 1076.

*Annal. Baron.
an. 1076.*

To conclude, it is most certaine, that those which sound in your eares the Fathers and the Councils, do

it

The Preface, to those

it not because the ancient Fathers are any thing fauorable vnto them, but because they know that the common people cannot tell how to disprove them, and that in those things you must of necessitie refer your selues vnto them. But touching the Scriptures, which you may and ought to know, and which rule all the Fathers, those you are forbidden to reade. Yeares are not rules, and lying was from the beginning of the world. And if custome may serue for a law, tell me how many yeares at the least are required to authorise a doctrine? The Church is not in a countrey gouerned by custome, but in a countrey gouerned by a written law. There is no prescription against the diuine truth. In the time of the Apostles this mysterie of iniquitie began to be hatched. How much then, thinke you, is it now increased? And in truth both the people and the pastors of the Church of Rome crie out since certaine yeares past, that the Church hath need to be reformed. At the Councell of Pisa, *an. 1411.* Pope *Alexander* the first, in the 20. Session, solemnly promised to spend some time to take order for the reformation of the Church, and to that end to assemble the wisest men of all nations. Not long after that, there was a Councell holden at Senes, *anno 1423.* where the proposition of the reformation of the Church was laid vpon the table, and after referred to another time: for they saw that they could not stirre that stone without shaking the Papall dignitie.

But that which great personages would not do, God hath done it by meaner men, vsing vnexpected and vn-hoped for meanes, to set the doctrine of saluation before the peoples eyes, in despite of all the forces that Satan could vse against it.

You are bound and beholding vnto those that haue
taken

of the Church of Rome.

taken paines and trauelled in this worke, for this, that the holy Scripture (which the people saw not) is now translated into our mother tongue; and that the Spirit of God speaketh French, in such manner that no man can be ignorant of the word of God, but he that wilfully shuts his owne eyes for feare to see the light. You are bound vnto them also for this, that the Pope doth now tyrannize lesse ouer you then he did foure or fife hundred yeares past, and that your bondage is eased a fourth part: for then the Pope gaue those French men that at his commandement armed themselves (besides the remission of all their sinnes) a degree of honour in Parádise aboue other men. But if now at this day he would by a Croysado send the French men into a farre country to fight against heretickes, or to conquer certaine townes (vpon his enemies) for him, as he did not long since, you would mocke and iest at his commandement. Then his manner was, when a King had offended him, to interdict his kingdome, and by that meanes (as much as in him lay) to excommunicate diuers millions of people, to command an intermission of diuine Seruice to be made throughout a great country, to forbid the bells to be rung, to hinder burials, and to expose the country for a prey to him that first could conquer it. England was fixe yeares and a halfe in that state in the time of King *John*; but at this day he puls his sword no more out of the sheath, fearing that taking so much vpon him, he should be the meanes to overthrow his own dignitie, which the doctrine of the Gospell hath already much shaken.

You are also beholding vnto vs, that sellers of pardons run not throughout France from house to house, as they did in the time of *Boniface* the 9. and *Leo* the 10. who

Such bulls are found in Matthew Paris, and in the third Tome of the Councils, at the end of the Council of Lateran vnder Innocent the third.

The Preface, to those

who for halfe a crowne sold to euery man that would haue them, a remission of all his sinnes, and the deliuerance of a soule out of Purgatory.

The time hath bene, that in France men commonly spake of miracles, of *S. Antonies* fire, and of the apparition of damned soules, or such as were come out of Purgatory, which illusions are for the most part vanished away at the rising of the Sunne of the holy Scripture, which the night of ignorance had hidden. And if at this day there are any small miracles spoken of, it is secretly, and neuer before vs: for before a man that feareth God, and knoweth him, Satan is as it were chained, and loseth all his force, and the magistrates themselves of your religion haue oftentimes punished such impostures corporally.

There are not many persons among you that wholly beleue in their religion, and that find not fault with the Church of Rome. For it is hard for a man to support the Decrees and the Glosses, which say, *that the Pope is above the law*, and *that he hath power to dispense against the Apostles and the Gospel*: and ^b call the Pope God, and Diuine^c maiestie: Or the lying Legends, which in many things compare and equalize *S. Dominicke* and *S. Francis* to Iesus Christ: Or the opinion of those that cause *S. Francis* Cowle to be put vpon them when they are dying, because (as their Doctors say) that Cowle is as good as a second baptisme: Nor the runnings of poore people for pardons two hundred miles off, when remission of all our sins is offered at home vnto vs by the doctrine of the Gospel: Nor the pardons of seven or eight hundred thousand years: Nor the priuiledged altars, whereon a Masse being said, a soule is deliuered out of Purgatory: Nor the opinion of those that teach,

^a Tit. 8. de Probend. cap. Pro-
posuit. Secun-
dum plenitu-
dinem potesta-
tis de iure pos-
sumus supra
ias dispensare.
Et ibid. Glossa:
Papa contra
Apostolum
dispensat. Item
contra verum
testamentum.
Item, in iura-
mento. Glossa
Dist. 34. Can.
Lector. Papa
potest contra
Apostolum dis-
pensare. Et
Causa 23.
quest. 1. Can.
Sunt quidam.
Glossa habet,
Dispensat in
Euangelio in-
terpretando
ipsum.
^b Glossa ex-
trau. Cum in-
ter Dominum
Deum nostrum
Papam.
^c Concil. La-
ter. vltimum
Sess. 9. Diuine
maiestatis tue
conspiciunt.

of the Church of Rome.

teach, * that the Pope can make that which is sin, to be no sinne, and that which is no sinne, to be sinne. And it is certaine, that although we should say nothing, yet the truth speaketh in the consciences of many persons that are holden vnder this captiuitie by the feare of men and their domesticall affaires; for the diuel tickleth men by the belly, and rocketh them in a cradle of pleasures and honours to bring them asleepe: whereby it happeneth, that the sparks of the truth knowne, are quenched in them, or if they be not quenched, they burne, and torment their consciences, & serue for nothing else but to make them more culpable, for hauing not onely buried their talent of the knowledge of God in the earth, but also for mispending the same; for hauing bene ashamed to confesse the Sonne of God before men, and not defending his cause when time required, and for fearing to offend men more then God, whose promises are certaine, his threatnings horrible, and his iudgements eternall and ineuitable: who hauing in our dayes shewed and done so many miracles to repaire the ruines of his Church in this Realme, will not leaue those unpunished that seeke to trouble his worke, and that expressly wander out of the way at high noone day.

All this which hath bene spoken proceeds from an ardent desire that we haue that you should be saued, and that God might be serued; for herein we haue no other interest then your saluation, seeing that for the defence of this cause, we receiue nothing but trouble, hatred and discommodities. We rather much more desire to liue in peace and amitie with our fellow citizens vnder one selfe same religion, if we could or might do it, without offence vnto God; and ceasse not to pray & beseech the Father of mercie (whose compassion surmounts

* Bellarm. in
Barth. cap. 31.
In bono sensu
dedit Christus
Petro potesta-
tem faciendi
de peccato non
peccatum, et
de non peccato
peccatum.

The Preface, to those

mounts our iniquities) that he will pardon those that haue vs, that he will touch their hearts with repentance, and illuminate their understanding with his light, to know the day of their visitation, and the way of eternall saluation, for feare that in the end he should turne his fauour from a people that turne their backs vnto him, and send greater darknesse then the first, vpon a nation that strueth against the light of the Gospell.

If these considerations moue any man, it will be no small ioy vnto me, and an ample reward of my labour: If it happeneth otherwise, we shall at the least haue deliuered our soules, and discharged our consciences, and serued for a witnesse in so hard and stiffnecked an age, attending till the Sonne of God come from heauen, to heare our griefes, to deliuer his children, and to reward euery one according to his workes: to him be glorie eternally. Amen.

Church in this Reformation, will not leaue this vantage
that she hath to trouble us with, and therefore

THE
line in peace and amitie, without fellow citizens
under one selfe same religion, if we could or might do
it without offence vnto God, and calling not to ray &
better the latter of these (which is the more com-
mon)



THE BVCKLER OF THE FAITH:

OR,

THE DEFENCE OF THE CONFESSION
of the reformed Churches of France, against the
Obiections of M. Arnoux a Iesuite.

THE FIRST ARTICLE.

The Confession.



WE beleue and confesse, that
there is one onely God, of one
onely & simple essence, spirituall,
inuisible, vnchangeable, infinie,
incomprehensible, vnspeakeable;
that can do all things, that is alto-
gether wise, altogether good, alto-
gether iust, and altogether mercifull.

THE SECOND ARTICLE.

This God manifesteth himselfe to be so vnto men,
first by his workes, as well in the creation, as in the con-
seruation and gouernment thereof. Secondly, and more
clearly, by his word, which in the beginning being re-
uealed

B

The Buckler of the Faith.

uealed by oracle, hath since by writing bene reduced into the bookes which we call the holy Scripture.

M. ~~Arnoux~~ dealeth not at all with these two articles, and consequently by his silence approueth them.

THE THIRD ARTICLE.

wherein the canonicall Scriptures are spoken of.

All this holy Scripture is contained and comprehended in the canonicall bookes of the old and new Testament, videlicet, The five bookes of *Moses*, which are, *Genesis*, *Exodus*, *Leuiticus*, *Numbers*, and *Deuteronomie*: *Iosua*, *Iudges*, *Ruth*, the first and second bookes of *Samuel*, the first and second bookes of *Kings*, the first and second bookes of *Chronicles*, (otherwise called *Paralipomenon*) the first book of *Esdra*, *Nehemia*, the booke of *Hester*, *Iob*, the *Psalmes* of *Dauid*, the *Prouerbes* or *Sentences* of *Salomon*, the booke of *Ecclesiastes*, called the *Preacher*, the *Canticles* of *Salomon*, the bookes of *Esay*, *Ieremie*, the *Lamentations* of *Ieremie*, *Ezechiel*, *Daniel*, *Osea*, *Iosl*, *Amos*, *Abdias*, *Ionas*, *Micha*, *Nabum*, *Abacuc*, *Sophonia*, *Aggee*, *Zacharias*, *Malachie*, the holy *Gospels* of *Saint Mathew*, *Saint Marke*, *Saint Luke*, and *Saint Iohn*, the second booke of *Saint Luke*, otherwise called the *Acts* of the *Apostles*, the *Epistles* of *S. Paul*, one to the *Romans*, two to the *Corinthians*, one to the *Galatians*, one to the *Ephesians*, one to the *Philippians*, one to the *Colossians*, two to the *Thesalonians*, two to *Timothie*, one to *Titus*, one to *Philemon*, one to the *Hebrewes*, the *Epistle* of *Saint Iames*, the first and second *Epistle* of *Saint Peter*, the first, second,

second and third Epistles of Saint *Iohn*, the Epistle of Saint *Iude*, and the Apocalyps or the Reuelation of Saint *Iohn*.

OF THE BOOKES CALLED
APOCRYPHA.

ARNOVX.

Out of this Canon they cut off the bookes of Tobie, Iudith, Baruch, Ecclesiasticus, the Wisdome of Salomon, and the Machabees, and all what soever displeaseth them, out of the Scriptures.

MOVLIN.

He that can reade the Hebrew tongue, knowes well that this accusation is false and vnttrue. The Hebrew Bible is the originall of the old Testament; for it was necessary and conuenient, that those bookes which containe in them the doctrine of the people of God, should be written in the naturall language of the people of God. Now the bookes of *Tobias*, and of *Iudith*, &c. are not found in the Hebrew Bible, how then can we cut those bookes out of the Bible, which were neuer therein? The Apostle Saint *Paul* in his third Chapter to the Romans, verse 2. saith, that *The diuine Oracles of God were committed vnto the Iewes*. Now the Iewes neuer acknowledged these bookes: they were not read in their Synagogues, neither did the Priests nor the Scribes euer expound them to the people.

The testimony of the Church of the old Testament is of more credit touching the bookes of the old Testament, then the Romane Church that now is. For here I speake of the Iewes; not such as they are at this day, but then when they onely were the Church and people of God. Reade *Iosephus* against *Appion*; alledged by *Eusebius*, lib. 3. cap. 16. There you shall see, that the Iewish Church did not receiue these bookes of *Iudith*, *Tobias*, &c. And Iesus Christ himselfe and

Page 41. of
his answer.

his Apostles, who often and many times alledge the bookes of the old Testament, neuer alledge those bookes: (M. Armon that saith, that Iesus Christ and his Apostles alledged them in the new Testament, should produce examples for the same.) But those that speake but by heare-say, commonly are most bold in their assertions. Iesus Christ in the last of Saint Luke, verse 44. comprehendeth all the Scriptures vnder the Law of Moses, the Prophets, and the Psalmes. Vnder any of these parts, neither the bookes of *Tobias*, *Indith*, *Ecclesiasticus*, *Susanna*, nor the *Machabees* are contained. Hereunto let vs adde the false fables which in these bookes are set downe vnto vs for truth.

In the fifth Chapter of *Tobias*, the Angell *Raphael* is falsely said to be one of the Tribe of *Nephthaly*, captiues in Nineue.

The Author of the Booke of *Indith*, in the fourth Chapter thereof, verse 2. and Chapter 5. 16. speaketh as if this historie happened after the destruction of the Temple, and after the returne from captiuitie: and yet in the first and second Chapters, this historie is recited as hauing hapned vnder the reigne of *Nabuchodonosor* reigning in Nineue, dead aboue sixtie yeares before; king *Arphaxad* reigning in Media: but then there was no king *Arphaxad*, for one king then reigned both in Assyria and Media: and likewise Nineue at that time was destroyed, witnesse the last verse of the booke of *Tobias*, conformable to the prophesie of *Nahum*: and not long before it had bene taken and destroyed by *Cyaxares* King of Media, as *Herodotus* writeth in his first booke.

In the 49. of Genesis, *Iacob* lying vpon his death bed, commendeth the spoyling and murder of the Sichemites, done by *Simon* and *Leui*, as an impudent and cruell action. Neuerthelesse, *Indith* in the ninth Chapter praiseth and exalteth that action. There also she desireth grace of God to deceiue with her lips: and purposely, being curiously and brauely attired, to moue the Pagan Prince to be in loue with her; she commendeth his valour and braue spirit, saith that she cannot refuse to do any thing that he requesteth. Chap. 12. 13. She pro-

promiseth to conduct and guide him throughout all Iudea, and to place his throne in Ierusalem, chap. 11. 16. so farre as falsely to interpose the Name of God for a couerture of her lies, verse 13. 14. and 15.

Saint *Augustine* in his second booke of Retractions, saith, that the booke of Wisedome was not made by *Salomon*. Saint *Hierome* attributeth it vnto *Philo* the Iew, in his Preface vpon the bookes of *Salomon*: neuerthelesse the Author of the booke affirmeth himselfe to be a King: and speaketh as if he were *Salomon*.

Saint *Hierome* in his Preface vpon the Commentaries of *Daniel* saith, that the booke of *Susanna*, and of Bell and the Dragon, are fables. And what apparence or likelihood is there, that a handfull of Iewes, captiues in Babylon, should haue Israelites for Iudges in Babylon, that should command one absolutely to be executed to death without appeale, and that a child should make himselfe a Iudge of Iudges, who without other forme of proceeding were condemned to die? Who knowes not, that in Babylon, the vulgar language was Chaldean, and not Greeke? and yet the Historie of *Susanna* with her Greek allusions vpon the etimologies of the Holme and the Masticke trees, presupposed that the ordinary language which they vsed in iudgemnts and publike actions was Greeke.

*Susanna Be-
lisque ac Dra-
conis fabulas
non continere
in Hebraico.*

*ὡς οὖν
οὐκ ἔστιν οὐ μόνον
ὁ ὅτις. ὡς
ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀπὸ τοῦ
αὐτοῦ.*

In the bookes of *Machabees*, *Antiochus* the famous died three times in seuerall manner: in the first booke chap. 6. he died at Babylon in his bed. But in the first Chapter of the second booke, he died in the Temple of *Nannaa* ouerwhelmed with stones: and in the ninth Chapter of the same booke he died in the mountaines, falling out of his chariot as he returned out of Persia; and all that is said to happen in the time of *Iudas Machabeus*, in whose time there was but one onely king *Antiochus*.

In the eight Chapter of the first booke of *Machabees*, it is said, that the Romans had taken king *Antiochus* the Great prisoner, and that they had given the Indies to *Eumenes*. All that is false. The Romans ouerthrew *Antiochus* in three bat-

tels, but neuer tooke him prisoner. They neuer had any part of the Indies: their greatest Empire neuer extented it selfe much beyond the riuer Euphrates. See Saint *Ierome* vpon *Daniel*, *Appian Alexandrine*, *Zozimus* and *Iustin*.

Little children know, that then the Romans euery year made two Consuls that had soueraigne power: but in the sixteenth verse of the eight Chapter of the first booke of *Machabees* it is said, that the Romans euery year committed the government of their Seigniorie to one man alone.

In the twelfth Chapter of the first of *Machabees*, there is an excellent thing to be noted, which is, a letter written by *Arius* king of Sparta, to *Onias* the high Priest of the Iewes, wherein it is said, that they of Sparta, (which are the Lacedæmonians,) are of *Abrahams* race. Can there be a foolisher thing alledged? And it is to be found, that in the time of *Onias*, there was no such king *Arius* in Sparta. For *Arius* (as *Pausanias* in his *Laconiques*, and *Plutarch* in the life of *Pyrrhus* say) liued aboute eightie yeares before that.

In the first Chapter of the second booke, and nineteenth verse, it is said, that the Iewes were led captiues into Persia, in stead of saying into Babylon.

In the second Chapter it is said, that *Jeremie* hid the Arke of the Lord in a ditch, that it might be found againe when God should reassemble the people, when they returned out of captiuitie: which is contradicted by *Jeremie* himselfe in the third Chapter and sixteenth verse, where it is said, *In those dayes, saith the Lord, they shall say no more, the Arke of the covenant of God.* And in the Temple built againe by *Zerobabel* the Arke was no more there.

Rabbi Shelomo Lurki in his prophetic Aggei, v. 8.

And at the end thereof, the Author acknowledging his weaknesse, doubteth whether he had said well or no. *If (saith he) I haue done well, and as it is fitting the Historie: and a little after, If I haue spoken slenderly and meanely, it is that which I could attaine vnto.* The spirit of God doubteth not whether he hath said well, excuseth not his stile, nor confesseth his imbecillitie. In the vulgar translation the Author asketh pardon, saying, *If I haue not spoken as I should do, you must pardon me.*

me. Is it a conuenient thing for the Spirit of God to aske pard on of men ? And which is more , in the second Chapter, verse 19. he aduertiseth vs what account we should make of his booke, saying, *We will assay to abridge the fine bookes of Iason the Cirenian into one volume.* What ? shall the abridgment of a prophane booke be a Canonickall booke ? To follow the inspirations of the Spirit of God, must we follow the steps of a prophane booke ? He also saith that he hath made that abridgment with great labour and much watching, as if he had taken extreme paines to make a small booke ful of fables.

The booke of the rest of the Historie of *Hester*, in many things contrarieth the booke of *Hester* which is in the Hebrew Bible. In the first Chapter it is shewed, that it happened in the second yeare of king *Artaxerxes*, which in the true Historie, chap. 2. verse 16. is placed in the seuenth yeare of *Assuerus*. *Haman* is called a Macedonian, chap. 6. verse 10. who in the true Historie is said to be an Agagien, that is, an Amalekite. And this lying booke in the fourteenth verse saith, that *Haman* sought to transport the Empire of the Persians to the Macedonians. As if one should say, that some French man should haue enterprised to transport the Empire of the Turkes to the king of *Iueter*: for then the kings of Macedonia were little kings, vnknowne to the Persians, and of no power.

ARNOVX.

They quote no text in the margent. This Canon of the Scriptures made according to their pleasures, and without authoritie, hath no prooffe in the Scripture, by the which they can iustifie this enormous abridgment of the number of the bookes in times past received in the ancient Church. Therefore I challenge this fundamentall article to be false, and nought worth. 2. Section.

MOVLIN.

This discourse is as much as nothing, for it hath no ground. This Doctor requireth of vs a passage in the holy Scriptures, which containeth the catalogue and number of the canonickall

bookes. I answer, that as to proue there is but foure Euangelists in the new Testament, it is not necessary to produce a passage which saith, that there is but foure bookes of the Gospell, that is, Saint *Matthews*, Saint *Markes*, Saint *Lukes*, and Saint *Iohns*, but it is sufficient to reade the titles, and to looke ouer the inscriptions of the bookes: so to proue by the Scripture, the number of the canonick bookes, it sufficeth to take the Bible in the originall tongue, and looke ouer the titles of the bookes. By this meanes you shall there finde all the bookes contained in the article of our Confession: and there you shall not find *Tobias*, *Iudith*, the *Machabees*, &c. So the Apostles Creed is found by peeces in the Scripture, although it be not found whole in any one passage alone. The holy Scripture saith, that God is Truth, *Rom. 3*. Then it followeth, that the bookes full of lies, as *Iudith*, and the *Machabees*, are not the word of God. Then touching this Discourse made by M. *Arnoux*, we will, as he doth, say nothing.

ARNOUX.

3. Sect.

Contrary places of Scripture, Apocalyps 22. verse 19. If any man shall diminish of the words of the booke of this prophesie, God shall take away his part out of the booke of life, and out of the holy Citie, and from those things which are written in this booke, *Deuter. 12. 32.* What thing soeuer I command you, obserue to do it, thou shalt not adde thereto nor diminish from it. *And more plainly, Chap. 4. 2.* You shall not adde vnto the word which I command you, neither shall you diminish ought from it. *These passages according to the sense which they giue vnto them, and according to the vse whereunto they employ them, without reply overthrow the third article quoted before: albeit they haue no force against our traditions: which is an argument against him that so hardly presseth vpon them. For if by these passages they ordinarily dispute against our traditions, as peeces that are out of the formall passage of the holy Scriptures, by the same passages I reuerseth their Canon, whereof I finde no formall passage: which to haue, it is necessary that the ex-*
cluding

cluding of the passages which they reject, must be formally marked in some place of the Scripture; with the numbring of all those bookes which they receive.

MOVLIN.

I haue already answered to that, and shewed that the numbring of the canonicall bookes is expressly proued by the Scriptures: whereby the passages which condemne those that adde or diminish, to or from the word of God, touch not vs at all; but are so many thunder-bolts against the Church of Rome, which establisheth traditions, and an vnwritten word, to be of like authority with the holy Scriptures: but that shall be made more euident in the Section following.

ARNOVX.

Then I say, That the Canon of the Scriptures is an article of 4. Sect. the faith.

MOVLIN.

To speake properly; The articles of the faith, are the doctrines of Christian religion. In this sence, the numbring of the canonicall bookes is no article of the faith, but a declaration and numbring of the bookes from whence the articles of the faith and the instructions of Christian religion are drawne. In the same maner, as the numbring of the books of *Hippocrates* and *Galen* is not a precept of Physicke, but a designation to the places and the bookes wherein the precepts of Physicke are to be found; and that is the meaning of our Confession. For seeking by order to set downe the articles and doctrines of Christian faith, at the beginning it declareth from whence these doctrines are drawne. Which declaration is no addition to the Scripture: first because that this numbring of the catalogue is proued by the Scripture, as we haue shewed. Secondly, forasmuch as to declare that such bookes are canonicall, (that is, rules of our faith,) is not to adde any thing to those sacred bookes, but rather to declare that we must not adde any thing vnto them. It is an acknowledgement that we make of their perfection, and of
our

our obedience. When we say that the Scripture is sufficient to saluation, thereby we vnderstand, that we must reiect all those doctrines which adde any thing to the Scriptures. Now to say that these bookes are canonicall, is not to adde any thing to the Scripture, but to declare that we must not adde anything thereunto. Then it is false that maister *Arnoux* saith, that setting down this number of the canonicall bookes, we adde something to the Scripture, seeing that on the contrary we thereby declare, that we must adde nothing thereunto, for that those bookes are the canon and rule of our faith.

*Of the testimony which the Church giueth of the
Canonicall bookes.*

ARNOUX.

3. Section. *Then I say: The Canon of the Scripture is an article of the faith, and being an article of the faith, either they receiue it immediately from the Church of God, (whether it be Iudaicall or Christian,) or from the holy Scripture. If from the Church, they do vainly attribute the discretion and knowledge of this Canon to the interior perswasion of the Spirit, and falsely teach in their fift article, that the Scripture is the rule of all that which we ought to beleene. If from the Scripture, let them quote some formall passage, together with the booke and the chapter, where this Canon is set downe, and the excluding of the rest of the bookes which the Church receineth: which because they neither do nor can, let them confesse, that this Canon which is the foundation of all their Beliefe, is grounded upon nothing, and not upon the word of God, and by them added to the Scripture.*

MOVLIN.

Before, 4,
Section.

We haue already confuted that, and proued that the numbring of the canonicall bookes, contained in the article of our Confession, and the excluding of the rest that are apocrypha,

pha, is clearely proued by the Scripture; and that, if it could not be proued by the Scripture, yet this numbring doth not adde any thing to the Scripture. Touching that which he demandeth, whether we receiue the canon of the Scripture immediatly from the Church of God: I acknowledge, that euery one receiue the holy Scripture immediatly from the Church in his countrey where he dwelleth, whether it be a pure, or an impure and hereticall church. So the Apostles receiued the bookes of the old Testament from the High priests and the Scribes, enemies to Iesus Christ. So the Nestorians and the Eutychians gaue the Scriptures to those whom they taught. But herein the Church (be it pure or impure) onely doth the office of a witnesse, and not of a Iudge. She attesteth onely that those bookes are sacred and canonicall, but she maketh them not sacred; nor yet giueth them any authority. The tradition of the Church testifying that those bookes are diuine and canonicall, is but a protestation of her subiection to the Scriptures, and not an addition to their imperfection, nor an vsurpation of authority ouer the written word of God. The Booke-seller that sheweth a chapman a booke of the ordinances and laws of this Realme, doth not thereby authorise those ordinances. He that sheweth the King to a stranger, is not therefore about the King, neither giueth authority to the King. An inferior may testifie before a greater person then himselfe. And it hath often times fallen out, that a man hauing receiued the Scriptures by the hands of the church in his countrey, by the same Scripture hath corrected and iustly condemned the same Church of heresie from the which he receiued the Scripture.

That which is most considerable in this place, is, that as the Church attesteth that these bookes are the holy Scriptures, so the holy Scripture attesteth, that there must be a Church in the world; and that the Scripture abundantly teacheth what Church it ought to be, and prescribeth lawes vnto it. So it appeareth, that the testimony which the Scripture giueth of the Church, is much stronger then that which the Church giueth of the Scripture. For the witnesse which the Church

Church giueth of the Scripture, is a simple declaration to acknowledge those bookes to be the word of God, and a protestation to obey them. But the witnesse which the Scripture giueth to the Church, is a rule, and a law, making the Church subiect thereunto: for by the Scripture we vnderstand not the paper and the letters printed thereon, but the diuine instructions contained therein. The Church is compounded of men, who both in grosse and retaile, are subiects to this word, and shall one day be iudged by the same, howsoever they (with abominable pride) brag and boast themselves to be Iudges of the holy Scripture, and giue authority thereunto. Touching particular inspiration, and the perfection of the holy Scriptures, it shall be spoken of hereafter.

What the beleefe of the ancient Church was touching these Canonickall bookes. And whether the Church is the infallible Iudge of the sense of the Scriptures.

ARNOUX.

6. Section. As for us, in this respect we are out of danger, because we receive the Scriptures and the interpretations, Canon, and true sense of the same from the hand of Gods Spouse, and freely confesse that this Canon is a tradition, whereby we haue the truth, and the puritie of the holy Scriptures.

MOVLIN.

Our aduersaries to couer themselves against the Scripture, haue recourse to the Church, which Church neuertheless they belie, and openly contrary it. Maister *Arnoux* saith, that he hath receiued the Canonickall bookes from the Church, and in the meane time he opposeth himselfe against the number of the Canonickall bookes, and openly contradicteth the consent of all the ancient Church, as well of the old as the new Testament.

Touching

Touching the Church of the old Testament, we haue shewed, that by it the bookes of *Tobias*, *Iudith*, *Wisdom*, *Machabees*, &c. were neuer receiued, nor holden to be canonicall.

Touching the Church of the new Testament, Iesus Christ and his Apostles neuer vsed nor alledged them. The Councell of Laodicea holden about the same time that the first Councell of Nice was holden, maketh a catalogue of the bookes of the old Testament, wherein the bookes of *Tobias*, *Iudith*, *Ecclesiasticus*, *Wisdom*, *Susanna*, and the bookes of the *Machabees* are not numbred.

S. *Ierome* in his Preface vpon the bookes of *Salomon*, speaking of *Ecclesiasticus* and the *Wisdom* of *Salomon*, saith; *As the Church readeth the bookes of Iudith, Tobias, and the Machabees, but receiueth them not among the canonicall Scriptures; so also let her reade these two volumes, but not to confirme the faith of the Church.* Note here that he saith, that it is the beleefe of the Church. He saith the same in his Prologue.

Saint *Cyprian*, or rather *Ruffin*, in the booke of the Exposition of the Creed, after he had made a catalogue of the canonicall bookes, saith: *You must vnderstand that there are other bookes which the ancient Church did not call canonicall but Ecclesiasticall; as the Wisdom of Salomon, Ecclesiasticus, Tobias, Iudith, and the bookes of Machabees. All which they would haue to be read in the Church, but not to be cited for the confirmation of the authoritie of the faith.*

Saint *Athanasius* in his booke entitled Synopsis, names all the bookes of the old Testament, conformable to the Hebrew Bible, and then addeth, and saith: *Besides these there are other bookes of the old Testament, which are not canonicall, which are read onely vnto Catechumenians, as the Wisdom of Salomon, the Wisdom of Iesus the sonne of Sirach, Iudith, Tobias, &c.*

Eusebius in his Chronicle vpon the 117. Olympiade, saith, *The Hebrew history of the Machabees reckons from hence the reigne of the Grecians, but those bookes are not receiued among the diuine Scriptures.*

Pope

Pope *Gregorie* the first, in the 19. of his *Morals* vpon *Iob*, cap. 19. seeking to alledge a passage out of the *Machabees*, excuseth himselfe in these words: *Of which thing we speake not without reason, if we produce the testimonies of the bookes that are not canonically, but written for the edification of the Church.*

Meliton Bishop of *Sardis*, in an Epistle to *Onesimus*, recited by *Eusebius* in the fourth booke of his historie, cap. 15. numbred the bookes of the old Testament, wherein he placeth not *Indith*, *Tobias*, *Ecclesiasticus*, nor the *Machabees*.

Origen, in *Eusebius*, lib. 6. cap. 24. *Saint Hilarie* in his Preface vpon the Psalms, *Gregorie Nazianzen* in his verses of the holy Scripture, *Eusebius* lib. 3. of his historie, cap. 10. *Epiphanius* in his booke of Measures, and diuers others, make catalogues of the bookes of the old Testament, and put not *Indith*, *Tobias*, *Ecclesiasticus*, *Wisedome* nor *Machabees* into them, but all with one accord say, that there are but twentie two bookes in the old Testament, agreeable to the letters in the Hebrew Alphabet.

The fourth Councell of *Carthage*, in their Latine copies put the bookes of *Machabees* among the Canonically bookes; but in their Greeke copies they are not found to be there. It is most certaine, that there is no booke more falsified nor corrupted then the Latine tomes of the Councells.

Against this so vniuersall a consent of the ancient Church, they oppose the onely testimonie of *Saint Augustine*, who lib. 2. of Christian doctrine, cap. 8. putteth *Tobias*, *Indith* and the *Machabees* among the canonically bookes. But ye must vnderstand, that in the same place he maketh two sorts of canonically bookes, the one of greater, the other of lesse authoritie; the one really received, the other received by some Churches of lesse authoritie. In matter (saith he) of the canonically Scriptures, we must follow the greater number of Catholike Churches. And a little after, Among those which are not received of all, we must make most account of those, which more Churches; and of more authoritie do receive. And he himselfe in the 23. chap. of his second booke against *Gaudensius*, saith, that

In Canonis
Scripturis Ec-
clesiarum ca-
tholicarum
quamplym
authoritas
sequatur
In eis qua non
accipiuntur ab

that the booke of *Machabees* is not unprofitably read, if it be omnibus, pra-
read discreetly: and that the same booke is none of those whereof ponat ear quas
Iesus Christ witnesseth. Also in the same place of the 2. booke of *plures grauior-*
Christian doctrine, he acknowledgeth that the booke of *Wif- resque accipi-*
dome was not made by *Salomon*: which is a proofoe that the unt, cui quas
Author thereof lyeth, which affirmeth himselfe to be *Salomonisque au-*
mon. And in the same place he omitteth the booke of *Susan- thoritatis Ec-*
na, and the historie of *Bell* and the *Dragon*, as not being *closa tenent.*
canonicall. And in the three and twentieth Chapter of the same
booke, as also in diuers other places, he beleueed not that
Samuel appeared to * *Saul*, but is of opinion that it was his
image and a diuellish illusion, therein contrarying the booke
of *Ecclesiasticus*. In the seventh tome *Hilarie* Bishop of *Arles*
writeth to *Saint Augustine*, and telleth him, that diuers seruants
of *Christ* in *France* did not thinke well of him, that he had
alleged a passage of *Ecclesiasticus* in his booke: * *They define*
(saith he) *that the same passage ought to be omitted, as not*
being canonicall. It is to no purpose to say, that diuers *Fa-*
thers alledge these bookes, for they also alledge the third and
fourth bookes of *Esdras*, which the Councell of *Trent* re-
ceiueth not for canonicall. *Ambrose* alledgeth them in the
tenth Chapter of his booke of the benefit of death, cap. 10.
and *Augustine* in the sixth Chapter of the fourth booke to
Boniface. The allegations of particular persons are no pub-
licke rules, nor the opinion of the vniuersall Church. A man
may alledge a booke which is not holden to be canonicall,
S. Paul, alledged *Aratus* and *Epimenides* Pagan Authors.

Now it appeareth whether *M. Arnoux* hath any know-
ledge of Antiquity, and whether he hath reason to say, that he
hath receiued the Canon of the Scriptures from the Church:
seeing that all the ancient Church reiecteth those bookes
which the Church of *Rome* receiues for canonicall. But now
at this day, when we speake of the Church, we must by the
Church vnderstand the Pope. For the Councell of *Rome*, holden
in the yeare 1076. vnder *Gregorie* the seventh, ordained,
that no chapter nor booke should be held to be canonicall, with-
out the Popes authority. Must we haue an approbation
from

* *Imago Sa-
mueli moriui
Sauli regi ve-
ra pronuncia-
uit.*

See the 15.
Chapter of
the booke,
de cura pro
mortuis.

* *Hoc siquam
non Canonicum
definiunt o-
mittendum.*

Acts 17. 28.
Tit. 1. 12.

Baron. Annal.
anno 1076.
sect. 33. *Quod*
nullum capitulum,
nullusq;
liber Canonici
cus habeatur
absque illius
authoritate.

from the Pope to receiue the five bookes of *Moses*, and the foure Euangelists for canonicall? What he is that doth not abhorre the impious words of the Romish decree, in the 19. distinction of the Canon *In Canonicis*: whereof the superscription is, That the decrees of Popes are reckoned among the canonicall bookes? which they proue by a passage out of Saint *Augustine* wickedly falsified.

Inter canonicas Scripturas Decretales Epistola connumeratur.

With the like impietie, at this day, they will haue the Church to be iudge of the sence of the Scriptures. There are two kindes or sorts of iudgements, the one a iudgement of discretion, the other a iudgement of authority. By the iudgement of discretion we iudge of meats, not to prescribe lawes, but to discern what is good for vs. Of this iudgement the Apostle speaketh in the first of the Corinthians, chap. 10. verse 15. *I speake as vnto them which haue vnderstanding, iudge ye what I say.* By this iudgement, Saint *Iohn* in his first Epistle chap. 4. will haue vs not to beleue euery spirit, but that we should trie the spirits. But there is another kinde of iudgement, which is a iudgement of authority; which serueth for a law, and which maketh decrees, against the which it is not lawful to resist: In that maner the court of Parliament iudgeth capital crimes. Between these two kinds of iudgement, there is a third kind, which participateth with the other two, which being a iudgement of discretion, in the meane time hath a kinde of authority: As when diuers learned and wise men glue their aduice vpon any difficult matter, specially if they be men to whom, by the commandement of God, we owe respect and reuerence. Whom, although subiect to erre, and though they pronounce not iudgement with soueraigne authoritie and infallible certainty, we are neuerthelessse ashamed to contradict; and we are bound to be content with their iudgement, vntill the thing be better knowne and examined. Such is the iudgement of diuers Pastors assembled in a nationall or a prouinciall Synode: whose iudgement neuerthelessse is not soueraigne, but subiect to be examined by the word of God: as latter Councils oftentimes correct precedant Councils. But to esteeme that the Church may iudge of matters

matters of faith, and of the sence of the Scriptures, with a iudgement of soueraigne authoritie and with infallible certainty; it is a thing not onely vniust and absurd, but also impossible. For, in the question whether the Church is iudge, or not, is it possible that the Church should be soueraigne and infallible Iudge therein? and when question is made, to know what the duety of the Church is, is it reasonable that the Church should be Iudge, with full authority of deciding the same? for by this meanes, she shall be bound to do no more then she will her selfe, and to obey those lawes which she shall giue vnto her selfe. And when question is made of the infalliblenesse or authority of the Church, if the Church be Iudge therein, she shall be Iudge in her owne cause. Seeing therefore, that all the Prelates of the Church are sinners, and by consequence culpable, and punishable by the Law, what apparence is there, that criminals should be soueraigne and infallible Iudges of the sence of that Law which concerneth their crime? by this meanes they shall neuer be condemned. It is a ridiculous and prophane conceit, to imagine that transgressors of the Law should be infallible Iudges of the same Law whereby they ought to be iudged. If the Church were an infallible Iudge of the sence of the Scriptures, her authority should be much greater then that of God: for such an interpreter would be much more obeyed then the law-maker; for that the people should not be subiect to the words of the Law, but to the sence and the interpretation which that interpreter would giue thereupon: which is the meanes whereby the Pope hath made himselfe so great, and so rich; for still he interpreteth the word of God for his profit, and hath proceeded so farre, that in the Romish decrees, *Cause 25.* there are glosses that say, that the Pope *may dispence with the* *quasi. i. cau.* *Scriptures, by interpreting the same.* *Sunt quidam.* *Dispensatio* *Euangelio in-* *terpresando* *ipsam.*

Neuerthelesse, let vs say that so absurd and impossible a thing is iust and receivable; yet, Before the authority of a Iudge and an infallible interpreter of the Scripture be referred to a Church, we ought to be well assured, that the same Church is of sound iudgement, and pure in the faith. Into the

which examination, if we enter by the Scriptures, then such a Church is subiect to be iudged by the Scripture. Or if to know whether such a Church is pure in faith, men refer themselves to the iudgement of the same Church, she will be sure not to condemne her selfe, And there is no Church, how corrupt soeuer it be, which vaunteth not of her selfe to be pure. And among diuers Churches, as the Syrian, the Greeke, the Romaine, and the Affricane, who all draw their successions from the Apostles, and boast that they haue *Saint Peters* chaire; why should one be iudge rather then the other? Then we must necessarily haue recourse to the Scripture, which is one, and received by all, and an vncorrupted Iudge, and wherein that which is cleare and euident, hauing no need of an interpretation, is sufficient to saluation. Where, if in things necessary to saluation, there are any obscure passages, they are found to be interpreted and expounded in diuers other cleare passages. For no man but the Law-giuer, can giue interpretations to the Law, that are of equall authority with the Law. And if there be any obscure passages found in the Scriptures, which are not expounded elsewhere, it is better to be ignorant, then to presume to be infallible Iudges of the sence of the Word, by the which God shall iudge vs: for that which therein is cleare and manifest, is sufficient to saluation.

THE FOVRTH ARTICLE OF THE CONFESSION OF THE FAITH.

*wherein M. Arnoux handleth particular inspiration,
and the interpretation of the Scriptures, and the
witness which the Church giueth to
the Scriptures.*

We confesse these bookes to be Canonically, and
certaine rules of our faith, not so much by the com-
mon

mon consent and agreement of the Church, as by the testimonie and interior perswasion of the holy Ghost, which makes vs to discerne them from the other Ecclesiasticall books, vpon the which (although they be profitable) we cannot ground any article of faith.

ARNOUX.

This is to make euery faithfull person a iudge established by God, 7. Section.
to approue and reprove the Scriptures by a more infallible spirit in euery one of them, then it is in the vniuersall Church, seeing, that by their saying, it may erre, notwithstanding the infallible assistance of the holy Ghost: and yet neuerthelesse euery faithfull person in particular hath a sure and a domestique spirit which maketh him a certaine iudge of the Scriptures, and of their sence and translation, without the which the sence cannot be penetrated by them that know not the languages.

MOVLIN.

Here the aduersarie doth as he vseth to do in all other places, that is, he changeth the words of our Confession, and maketh vs say things that we do not belecue: which is a manifest and euident prooffe that the truth of our religion is very strong, seeing that they cannot dispute against it, vntill they haue first changed it. By this meanes our aduersaries strue not against our Confession, but against their own inuentions. M. Arnoux imputeth to our Confession, that it maketh euery man a particular iudge established by God, to approue and reprove the Scriptures, and infallibly to iudge of the sence and translations of them. But the article of our Confession saith nothing so. Therein we speake not of a iudge established by God, nor of iudging infallibly of the sence and interpretation of the Scriptures: for none of vs attribute vnto our selues this qualitie of a Iudge iudging with authority and infallible certainty.

For, to discerne whether such a booke be Canonically, it is not necessary to haue a particular reuelation: onely we say

two things. The one, that the Spirit of God witnesseth to all Christians that God is no lier, and by consequence he witnesseth, that the bookes of *Judith* and of the *Maccabees* are not diuine books, because therein vntuths are palpable. The other, that the word of God contained in the holy Scriptures is full of efficacie, and that the Spirit of God vseth the same to touch the hearts without any need of pratically reuelation. For he that feareth God, feeleth by a liuely motion, and taketh pleasure in the language of the spirit of God, which of it selfe maketh a man sufficiently to vnderstand, hauing another manner of vertue then the language of men. Which vertue it our aduersaries do not feele, they ought not to mocke at a thing which they know not: but rather therein acknowledge the iust iudgement of God, which doth iustly, to take away from his word the efficacie thereof in them, for a punishment, because they do it iniurie, accusing it of obscuritie, ambiguitie, and imperfection, adding thereunto an vnwritten word, bereauing it of the dignitie to be a perfect rule & soueraigne Iudge, to cloath & inuest the Prelates of the Church, and mens traditions with that dignitie. Why should she make her spirituall motions to be felt by those that charge her with iniurious words, and which forbid and prohibite the reading thereof? Saint *Augustine* in the third Chapter of the eleventh book of his Confessions, acknowledgeth this interior efficacy of the Spirit of God, giuing testimony to our hearts, touching the truth of that which is contained in the Scriptures, and speaketh by experience. Vpon which passage, *Bellarmino* in his Sermon *De lumine fidei*, saith, *This light of the faith, is a certaine testimony of God, by the which it is said vnto the secret cogitations of our hearts, That is true, thou needest not to doubt thereof.* Euen as he that knoweth not that the Sunne is the Sunne, but onely because his mother told him so, and pointed to it with her finger, should ground vpon a prooffe a thousand times lesse cleare then the Sunne: so he that knoweth not that the holy Scripture is the Scripture, but onely because the Church wherein he liued told him so, without being touched in his heart with the efficacie there-
of,

of, groundeth himselfe vpon a prooffe a thousand times weaker then the holy Scriptures: which maketh it selfe to be sufficiently felt by those that do not contend and strue against the same, and without the which we should not know, that there must be a Church in the world.

It is true, that the Church putteth the Scripture into our hands: But after that by the same Scripture God hath touched our hearts, we do no more beleue that it is the holy Scripture, because the Church told vs so, but because the Scripture it selfe hath caused vs to know it, and that God thereby hath touched our hearts: without the which vertue the testimony of the Church is but a probable aide, which giueth a confused beleefe and a light impression. For no man can know with a certaine knowledge, that the testimonie which his Church giueth to the Scripture is true, if before that he knoweth not that the same Church is orthodoxall, and of a true iudgement touching the faith. Which a man cannot assuredly know, vntill he hath first knowne the rule of the true faith, which is the word of God. To be short, when we are once drawne to the reading and meditation of the Scripture by the testimonie of the Church, and haue begun to taste the same, and to comprehend the doctrine thereof, we may say as the Samaritanes did to the woman whereof it is spoken in the fourth of Saint Iohn: *Now we beleue, not because of thy saying, for we haue heard him our selues, and know that this is indeede that Christ the Saviour of the world.*

Here I would gladly demand two things of our aduersaries: one, whether they will haue euery faithfull Christian to receiue and approue the holy Scriptures, without knowing, vnderstanding, and comprehending them? To receiue them without knowing any thing in them, is to receiue them without fruite. Or if they will haue the people to haue knowledge in the Scriptures, whether they will haue them to discern them, and learning them, that they may be instructed with iudgement and discretion? The other, why they will not haue the people to iudge and discern that the bookes of the Scripture are sacred and diuine, and yet in the meane time

they will haue them to know and discerne the true Church, to distinguish it from the false? To discerne the true Church from the false, is it not requisite that euery Christian should be particularly assisted, and inwardly conducted by the Spirit of God? If it be so, why will they not haue euery faithfull Christian to haue need of the same assistance of the Spirit of God, to discerne the word of God from the word of men? If for an euasion they say, that to know certainly which is the orthodoxall and pure Church, there is no need of the aide and assistance of the Spirit of God, do they not make their religion prophane, and shew it to be led by opinion, custome, and humane reason?

In the meane time, all being well weighed and considered, it will be found that the same iudgement of discretion, which God giueth to the faithfull to discerne the word of God from the word of men, is the same iudgement whereby we discerne the true Church from the false; because that is the true Church, which beleeueth and teacheth the true word of God. Whosoever saith, that the people ought to discerne the true Church without discerning the true word of God, speaketh things contradicting one the other, and doth like one that would haue men to know who are iust, without knowing the rule of righteousness.

ARNOVX.

3. Section.

Passages quoted in the margent of the Confession. Psal. 12. 6. The words of the Lord are pure words, as silver tried in a furnace of earth, purified seven times. Psal. 19. 7. 8. The Law of God is perfect, converting the soule; the testimonie of the Lord is sure, making wise the simple; the statutes of the Lord are right, reioicing the heart; the commandement of the Lord is pure, enlightening the eyes. Not one of these passages do containe one onely word of that, in confirmation whereof they are alledged; which is, that it appertaineth to the members of the Church, rather then to all the Church, to discerne the true Scriptures from the false. If they be alledged as an eulogie and recommendation of the word of God, whereof there is no question, it is a deceiuing of the reader, that per-
swadeth

swadeth himselfe, that they are quoted for a prooſe of that which is in controuerſie, and whereof he ſeeth no other prooſe then in the margin.

MOVLIN.

Theſe two paſſages are not quoted in the margin, to proue a thing that we beleeuẽ not, and which M. *Arnoux* falſely attributeth vnto vs, that is, that it belongeth to the particular members of the Church, rather then to the whole body of the Church, to diſcerne the true from the falſe Scriptures. Theſe paſſages ſerue not to proue that: they are employed to proue theſe words of the article of our Confefſion; which is, that *theſe canonick bookes are a moſt certaine rule of our faith*: which is a point in controuerſie betweene vs and our aduerſaries, that accuſe the holy Scriptures to be inſufficient and obſcure, calling it a peece or part of a rule, and a two handed ſword, as we ſhall hereafter ſee. And what hurt is there done to alledge theſe paſſages vpon things that are not in controuerſie? Can we not inſtruct without diſputing?

A delphick ſword, or a ſword for both hands.

ARNOUX.

Of the interpretation of the Scriptures, and whether the Church of Rome is an infallible interpreter, and whether it belongs to euery particular perſon to interpret the Scriptures.

Contrarie paſſages. Saint Peter in his ſecond Epiſtle, Chap. 1. 6. Section. 20. No propheſie of the Scripture is of any priuate interpretation. Therefore it is contrary to the Apoſtolicke commandment, that euery one of you ſhould take vpon him to iudge the true ſenſe and vnderſtanding of the Scriptures. The interpreter hath his manner of interpretation, and aſſureth himſelfe to be iudge by a particular ſpirit, and for a foundation of all that which he ſhall beleene, layeth this preſumptuous and prohibited aſſurance.

MOVLIN.

The paſſage of Saint Peter is not contrary to the article of

our Confession, *S. Peter* in this passage reiecteth particular interpretations; but in the fourth article of our Confession, there is nothing said of interpretation, nor of the sence or intelligence of the Scripture. This man doth not vnderstand himselfe. And to what purpose should he impugn particular interpretations, seeing that we also condemne them? For it is so farre from vs to receiue the interpretation of a particular man for lawes, that we receiue not the interpretations of a particular Church, how great so euer it be, when such interpretations are given for infallible rules, and are equalized in authoritie with the holy Scriptures, as the interpretations of the Pope and of the Romish Church are.

It is true, that in our Sermons we interpret the Scriptures, but we giue not our interpretations for lawes: and alledge no other interpretations of the Scriptures, then those which the Scriptures themselues affoord. Whereby it is not our interpretation, but that which God himselfe giueth.

But this requireth a little more discourse, to let you see wherein our interpretations differ from those of the Romish Church: wherein there are five notable differences.

1. The first is, that the interpretations of the Scripture which we bring are drawne out of the Scripture it selfe: But the Romish Church draweth the most part of her interpretations from an vnwritten word, and from traditions. Thus when the word saith, *Thou shalt worship one onely God, and him onely shalt thou serue*, the Church of Rome vnderstandeth, that the adoration Latria is here onely reserued vnto God, but that the same hindreth not men from adoring Saints, Images, and the relicks with the adoration of Dulia. But the Scripture speaketh not of this adoration of Dulia giuen vnto creatures. So when the Apostle in the ninth Chapter and tenth verse to the Hebrewes so often inserteth, *That as it is appointed vnto all men, that they shall once die, so Christ was once offered to take away the sinnes of many, and that by the offering once made he hath sanctified vs*: the Romish Church vnderstandeth, that he speaketh there of the bloody sacrifice; & say, that besides that sacrifice, there is another sacrifice of the body of Christ which is not bloody,

bloody, that is, the Masse: but the Scripture speaketh not of this sacrifice of the body of our Lord without blood. So, when Iesus Christ said vnto Saint *Peter*: *Feede my sheepe*, the church of Rome vnderstandeth that to be said to *Peter*, and to his successours in the charge of the head of the vniuersall Church, which are the Popes of Rome. But the Scripture saith not, that Saint *Peter* should haue successours in his Apostollicall place, as the other Apostles also haue had none; and saith not that his successours should be Bishops of Rome. I could produce an infinite number of such examples.

2. The second difference is, that when we draw an interpretation of a passage in the Scripture, out of the Scripture, we exhort the people to looke into the place, and to read the Scripture, that every man may know whether we alledge it truly and proceed sincerely therein, according to the example of those of *Berea*, in the seuenteenth of the *Act*, who after they had heard the Apostle *Paul*, went to conferre his words with the Scripture, to know whether it were so, or not. On the contrary, the Doctors of the Romish Church, interpreting the Scripture to the people, will not haue them to consult with the Scriptures, which in those places where the Pope is absolutely obeyed, is a booke wholly prohibited to the people. And in Spaine or Italie, if any Italian or Spanish Bible be found in any Lay mans hands, it is a crime deseruing burning, and an Inquisition case.

3. The third difference is, That we giue not our interpretations for lawes, as if we were infallible interpreters, neither make we our selues iudges of the holy Scriptures. For we say, that in the cleare passages of the Scriptures that haue no need of interpretations, all that which is necessary for our saluation is contained. On the contrary, the Church of Rome attributeth vnto her selfe, the power to be an infallible iudge of the sence of the Scriptures, and of giuing interpretations that are of equall authority and force with the holy Scriptures. A prodigious thing, that sinners and guilty persons will take vpon them to be infallible iudges of the sence of the lawes which concerne their crimes and offenses.

That

That sinful men should be iudges of that word, by the which at the latter day they shall be iudged. And whereas our senses and our wils ought to be subiected to the word of God, that the word of God should be subiected to the sence and meaning of men. That Maister is like to be well serued, whose seruants be the interpreters of his commandements, and thinke it lawfull for them to say to their maister, Thou hast commanded vs to do thus, but we iudge that it ought thus to be vnderstood. This is to subiect religion vnto men, whereas men should be subiects to religion. Certainly, no man but the King can giue interpretations to the Kings proclamations and precepts that should be of equall force and authoritie with the Kings Edi&. None but God can bring interpretations to the word of God, which are of as much force and authoritie as the word of God is. I say, if there be any Prelates that are infallible interpreters of the word of God, and that vpon the sence of the Scriptures pronounce irreuocable decrees, that such Pastors haue much more authority then the law of God; because the people are not bound to follow the words of the law, but the interpretation of those Prelates. It were better to be an interpreter in this manner, then to be a law-giuer: and it is impossible that such an interpreter should be subiect to the law. For it is fit that he should be without sinne, lest he should make his interpretations of the law, couertures and cloakes of his sinne.

Therein, besides the impietie, the absurditie is most manifest; for, before that men should giue the Church of Rome the authority of an infallible iudge of the sence of the Scriptures, it is necessary to be first assured that it is sound, and of a good iudgement in faith. Into the which iudgement if we enter by the holy Scripture, then the Church of Rome is subiected to be iudged by the Scriptures. Or if to know whether the Church of Rome be pure in faith, we must reserue our selues to the testimonie of the Church of Rome it selfe, then she is iudge in her owne cause, and she will be sure not to condemne her selfe. So, when question is made, to know what the duty of the Church is: If in this question the

the Church be iudge, she is both iudge and partie, and will haue no other lawes but those which she her selfe will make and ordaine. And seeing that in the interpretation of the Scriptures, the Greek, Syrian, Affricane and Roman Churches are different, how shall a simple artificer know which interpretation is best? seeing the other Churches are ancients then the Romaine, and boast of Saint *Peters* chaire, and of diuers Apostles? We must therefore come to this point, that if they vnderstand the word *Iudge*, to signifie *Discerning*, (as when we iudge of meates by the taste,) every faithfull person ought to pray vnto God for grace to iudge, to discern, and to know the true sence of the Scripture. But if by *Iudging*, they vnderstand to pronounce decrees, and definitive and infallible iudgements, touching the sence of the Scriptures, thereby to bind other mens consciences; there is no man in the world that hath that power. That which is cleare and manifest in the Scripture, hauing no need of interpretation, is sufficient to saluation: or if there be any obscure places, they are clearely expounded elsewhere. And if there be any passages that are obscure, and cannot be vnderstood by other passages, it is better to be ignorant therein; then to play the interpreter with authority of a Iudge. For, for this cause God thought it requisite, that in his word there should be some places that are obscure among a great number of cleare and manifest places; that by those that are cleare he might instruct our ignorance, and by the obscure, proue our sobrietie and temperance.

4. The fourth difference betweene the Interpretations that we make of the Scriptures, and those of the Romish church, is, That they neuer as yet accused vs of wresting the Scripture for our owne profit, nor to haue giuen it a sence which serueth to make vs rich, or to aduance vs to worldly dignities; which is one of the great mischieses in the church of Rome. Couetousnesse and Ambition, that are ingenious to wrest and racke the Scriptures, haue found out and inuented admirable interpretations. In the first Tome of the Councils there is a Decree attributed to *Anacletus*, which saith, that

Cephas, id est,
apostolus prin-
cipium Apo-
stolorum.
It is the 7. in
the Hebrew.

Peter is Cephas, that is to say, Chiefe or Head, and holding the principall place among the Apostles. In the ninth Session of the last Councell of Lateran, the seventy one Psalm is alledged, where it is said, *All Kings shall fall downe before him, and all nations shall serue him*; as if it were spoken of the Pope. And a little after, that is attributed to the Pope which Iesus Christ saith in the 28. chapter of Saint *Matthew*, *All power is giuen vnto me in heauen and in earth*. Pope Boniface the eight in the Extrauagant *Unam Sanctam*, sheweth, that all the world ought to be subiect to the Pope, because in the tenth of *Iohn* it is written, *There shall be one sheepfold and one shepheard*. There also he proueth the superioritie of the Pope, by that which is written, *In the beginning God created heauen and earth*. For, saith he, there is, *in principio*, in the singular number, and not *in principijs* in the plurall number; which is a notable obseruation. There he proueth, that both the Swords are in the Popes power, that is, both the Spirituall and the Temporall, because that in the 22. of Saint *Luke*, the Apostles hauing said, *Lord, behold here are two Swords*, he said vnto them, *it is enough*. To the same end he applyeth that which God said to *Jeremie*, chap. 1. *See, I haue this day set thee over the nations, and ouer the Kingdomes*. Bellarmine in his book against *Barkley*, proueth the power of the Pope to depose Kings, by that which is said to Saint *Peter*, *Feede my sheepe*; also by that, that Saint *Paul* will haue *those that preach the Gospell to liue of the Gospell*. Kill and cate, alledged by *Baronius*, applied to moue and incite the Pope to thunder against, and to persecute the Venetians, is a ridiculous manner of interpreting the Scriptures. I could alledge a thousand such like interpretations, which are as many confessions of a bad cause, seeing it cannot be defended but by wrested passages; and violent and rash interpretations of the Scriptures. Therefore the church of Rome vsurpeth the title of an infallible Iudge of the sence of the Scriptures, to the end that where reason wanteth, it may be supplied by authority: for such proofes haue no force, but onely by the authority of him that propoundeth them.

5. The fifth and last difference is, that we cannot be charged nor accused to make profane and ridiculous interpretations, thereby to expose the holy Scriptures to be laughed at, as the church of Rome doth. The second Councell of Nice, which our Aduersaries place among the vniuersall Councils, vpon paine of cursing and excommunication commandeth the adoration of Images, and saith, *that they are of as much estimation as the Gospell.* Now to proue this detestable doctrine, the Fathers of that Councell produce diuers passages of the Scriptures, with a strange compasse, and extravagant subtiltie: and because the Iconoclastians mocked at those allegations, Pope Adrian the first expressly made a booke, and dedicated the same to *Charlemaine*, which is found at the end of the said Councell, whereby he maintaineth all those passages to be well alledged. The Fathers of that Council, for the adoration of Images had alledged this passage in the second of the Canticles: *Let me see thy countenance, let me heare thy voice.* And God created man in his owne image & likenesse, Gen. 1. Also that Abraham worshipped the Hethites, Gen. 23. That Moses worshipped Iethro his father in law, Exod. 18. That Iacob blessed Pharaos, Genesis. 47. And, No man when he hath lighted a candle, couereth it vnder a bushell, Luke 8. 16. Pope Adrian defendeth these passages, saying, *Reſte illud protulerunt:* They haue truly alledged them, & *valde nimis atque pulchre contra eos qui Imagines contemnunt, dixerunt poni lucernam sub modio.* They haue spoken excellent well, and with a good grace, against those that contemne Images, that they set a Lampe vnder a bushell. What man is he that hath any free or common sence, that will not detest such prophanation of the Scriptures? and yet these are the interpretations of the Church; it is a Councell that speaketh, and a Pope that defendeth this Councell.

He that desireth to see the horrible prophanation of the passages of the Scripture alledged in manner of a yeast, let him reade those that write of the mysteries of the Masse, and of the ceremonies of the Romish church: as *Innocent* the third, of the mysteries of the Masse; The booke of sacred Ceremonies: *Duraus* Rationall: Tolet of the instruction of Priests:

Tulle-

Tom. 3. Com-
cil, Editionis
Colon. pa. 205.

Enleman, &c. and there he shall finde the Scriptures most ridiculously wrested. They say, that the Altar must be of stone, because it is said, *Petræus Christus*: That Tapers are set vpon the Altar; because it is written, *I am the light of the world*: That the Priest kisseth the Altar, because in the Canticles it is written, *Let him kisse me with the kisse of his mouth*: That the Priest turneth his backe to the people, because it is written, *Thou shalt see my backe parts*, Exodus: 33. 23. That the Clarke that serueth the Priest, moueth and stirreth his body as the Priest doth, because it is written, *Where I am there also my seruant shall be*. That the Priest washeth his hands wise, because it is written, *Amplius lauame*, Psalme. 51. That the Bishop at Masse changeth his hose and his shooes, because it is written, *Put off thy shooes, for the place is holy*, Ex. 3. 5. With the like subtiltie the Pope at this day, when he is crowned, casteth certaine copper money among the people, saying, *Siluer and gold haue I none, but that which I haue, I giue thee*. Where religion is changed into a Comedie, it is no maruell that the Scriptures are exposed vnto laughter, and turned into a ridiculous sence. Thus much touching the interpretation which father *Arnoux* saith to be receiued from the hand of Gods Spouse, that is (as he vnderstands it) the Church of Rome. Thus you may see how the word of God is dexterously alledged, and God worthily serued.

whether the Church may erre: and whether the church of Rome hath erred.

10. Sect.

All this abuse is grounded vpon this supposition, that the Church cannot erre: that is, that the Church being assembled to decide matters of faith, cannot erre. A proposition, which being well weighed and considered, will be found to be rash, without reason and apparence, and by experience contradicted.

For if by the Church, our aduersaries vnderstand the Church of the elect predestinated to saluation, which S. Peter

in

in his first Epistle, chap. 2. calleth a *chosen generation*, and which the Apostle to the Hebrewes, chap. 12. calleth, *The assembly and congregation of the first borne which are written in beauen*: it is a great absurditie to aske, if the Church assembled to iudge the difference of religion may erre, seeing that it neuer assembleth to decide any point of faith.

If by the word *Church*, they vnderstand the vniuersall visible Church, which is, the assembly of all those that make profession to be Christians, it is no lesse absurd, to aske if that Church assembled to iudge the points of faith can erre, seeing that now it is impossible for the same to be assembled: for it is composed of discordant parts, that is, of the Greeke, the Roman, the Syrian, and the Affrican Churches; &c. which are particular Churches separated from communion. For who shall assemble them? who shall set them at agreement? who shall be arbitrator of their discord? who shall be president in that assemblie? seeing that euery one of them attributeth vnto her selfe the perfections & testimonies which God giueth to his Church in his word.

But if by the word *Church*, our aduersaries vnderstand a particular Church, as that of Rome, of Antioch, or of Constantinople, they themselves confesse, that euery particular Church may erre: and say that the Church of Ierusalem founded by Iesus Christ, and that of Antioch founded by *Peter* erred.

The holy Historie witnesseth, that the Church of Israel, which vnder the old Testament was the onely Church in the world, oftentimes erred. It was idolatrous in Egypt, Ezech. 20. 7. 8. The people in the desert worshipped the golden Calf, to the which also *Aaron* the high Priest erected an altar, and proclaimed a solmne feast vnto it, Exod. 32. *Uriah* the high Priest erected a pagan altar in the temple of God, 2. Kings 16. In the fifteenth Chapter of the second of Chronicles it is said, *Now for a long season Israel hath bene without the true God, and without a teaching Priest, and without Law.* Which cannot be vnderstood of the ten Tribes that revolted from the covenant of God; for that a little after he addeth, that

that they turned againe vnto God, but those ten Tribes neuer turned. *Jeremie* in cap. 2. 27. 28. reprocheth the Church of Iuda, that it had had as many gods as townes; & that the Kings, Priests, and Prophets, said vnto the woods, thou art my father, which is the language of idolaters. He maketh the like complaints, cap. 5. 31. and cap. 6. 14. And *Isay* cap. 56. saith, *All thy watchmen are blind, they are all ignorant, they cannot keepe.* It is hard to maintaine that the high Priests, Scribes, and Pharises, that held *Moses* chaire and the ordinary succession, did not erre in the faith, when being assembled they decreed, that *whoſoever did confesse Iesus to be Christ, should be cast out of the Synagogue.* *Iohn.* 9. 12. Which is one of the causes (among many others) for the which Iesus Christ warneth his disciples to beware of the leauen of the doctrine of the Pharises, in the sixteenth of *S. Mathew*: whose instructions Iesus Christ would haue the Iewes wholly to obserue when they preached in *Moses* chaire, but not when they preached against *Moses*, and against the Law: for that is not a succession, but an ouerthrowing of the chaire and the doctrine. Among whom *Caiphas* the high Priest and head of that succession, iudged that Iesus Christ was a blasphemer and worthy of death, *Math.* 26. Then, when the said prelate in the eleuenth of *S. Iohn*, prophesied that one man was to die for the whole nation, he did not prophesie because the infallible truth was fixed to his chaire, but God inspired him extraordinarily, to the end that that prophesie whereby the price and the vertue of the death of Iesus Christ is declared, might be of more weight and authority among the Iewes, in regard of the quality of the person.

If the Church then which was the onely Church in the world, and the Pastors that onely held the chaire erred, is it credible, that when the Church is denided into contrarie Churches, and into chaires separated from communion, one particular Church may or can presume not to erre, and to subiect all others to her will? and that without producing her priuiledges? and contrary to the experience of so many ages, and the iudgement of all antiquities?

The sixt Councell held in Constantinople, in the thirteenth Canon condemneth the Church of Rome by name, because she reiecteth married Priests; and in the fiftie and fiftieth Canon because she fasted on the Saturday. Those fathers then beleeued that the Church of Rome could erre: The Greeke and the Romane Churches ioyned together in the second Councell of Nice, did they not erre, when in that Councell they decreed, vpon paine of cursing and excommunication, that images ought to be adored; and that they are of as much estimation as the Gospell, and that the image is better then the word, where in the tradition it is said: *Maior est imago quam oratio*

And after the death of Pope *Formosus*, so many times vnburied by his successors and drawne about the towne, and after laid honourably in the graue againe; how many contrary Councels, wherein the Popes were presidents) were there, that allowed and disallowed the decrees and ordinances of precedent Councels? And you must note, that then there was a question about a point of doctrine, which was, whether the Pope may dispence with an oath made to God, and whether he ought to be held to be a lawfull Pope, that had receiued the Papacie contrary to the oath which he had made neuer to take it on him.

Platina.
Stella.
Anastasius.
Luitprandus.
Sigibert, &c.

Did not the Church of Rome erre in the Councell of Rome holden vnder *Gregorie* the seuenth, anno 1076, where it was declared and defined, that there was *no other name vnder the heauens but that of the Pope*? and that *no booke is canonically without his authority*; and that *all kings ought to kisse his feet*?

Baron. Annal.
anno 1076.

Did not the Church of Rome erre in the Councell of Latran vnder *Innocent* the third, where power is given to the Pope to dispossesse and driue Princes that are excommunicate out of their lands and Signiories? cap. 31.

Or in the Councell of Constance holden anno 1414. where she declared, that we must neither obserue faith nor promise with heretickes, and that it is lawfull to put them to death after safe conduct is giuen them? And that to haue the peo-

ple to receiue the Sacrament vnder both kinds, following the example of Iesus Christ and the ancient Church, is rashnesse, and an heresie punishable by the secular power?

Or in the Councell of Florence, holden anno 1440: where it is decreed that the Pope may adde to the Creed?

Or in the last Councell of La tran, where the holy Scriptures were laid at the Popes feet, and he called a king much like vnto God? where also it is said, that all people ought to adore him: that he hath all power both in heaven and earth, that he is the Lyon of Iuda, the Roote of *Dauid*, the Sauour of Sion, and the diuine Maiestie?

Lastly, shall the Church of Rome continue pure and entire, then when (according to the opinion of our aduersaries) Antichrist shall abolish the Masse? or at the time whereof Iesus Christ speaketh, Luke 18. *Think you when the Sonne of man cometh, that he shall find faith on the earth?*

1. Thess. 1.

To be short, to say that she cannot erre, is a language that onely belongeth vnto God, or to him that maketh himselfe to be God, whom Saint *Paul* calleth the Sonne of perdition. The Apostles neuer bragged that they could not erre, notwithstanding that the Spirit of God guided them in all truth. Whosoever saith, I cannot fall by ignorance, is partly fallen by pride: whosoever saith I cannot erre in the interpretation of the Scriptures, makes himselfe infallible Iudge of that doctrine by the which one day he shall be iudged. He that is fallen shall neuer rise againe, as long as he presumeth that he standeth. He will not be subiect to any rule as long as he thinketh himselfe to be the rule: and there is no riches nor dignity whatsoever vpon earth, whereunto he will not aspire, seeing that no man may contradict him. By this meanes the Scripture will be held and esteemed to be of little necessitie: for what need I studie, if a man that cannot erre leadeth me directly vnto heaven? If God, to the end that the people should not be seduced, hath given those Prelats the vertue not to erre, it is wonder that he did not likewise giue them the vertue neuer to be vicious, seeing that nothing causeth Atheisme sooner to breed among the people, then the pro-

phane

phane liues of Pastors, whereof being conuincied it maketh the doctrine contemptible. The Canon, *Si Papa*, in the fortieth Distinction teacheth vs that in most expresse termes, which saith: *If the Pope being negligent of his owne saluation, and of the saluation of his brethren, unprofitable and slacke in his businesse, and besides that doing no good, in the meane time he leadeth after him, being himselfe first a bondslawe of sinne, innumeraule multitudes of people into perdition, so he is tormented with him by many plagues: let no man presume to reprehend him for the same, because he that should iudge all men, ought not to be iudged by any man, if he be not found to haue erred from the faith.* This speech certainly is diabolicall: and yet he that to flatter the Pope hath vomited out so many impieties, freely acknowledgeth that the Pope may erre from the faith. Whereupon I am, and haue oftentimes bene abashed, wherefore the Pope that vau- teth that he cannot erre in the deciding of doubts, abstaineth (now many yeares past) from pronouncing any definitiue sentence vpon the controuersie which is in the Church of Rome, about the questions of freewill and predestination: for the which the Iacobins and the Iesuits in Spaine are at continuall strife.

The props wherewith they support this proud doctrine are so weake, that if you blow vpon them they are ready to fall. They alledge vnto vs, that it is said in the second chapter of Malachie: *For the Priests lips should keepe knowledge, and they should seeke the Law at his mouth, for he is the messenger of the Lord of hosts.* But it is a great abuse to make a promise of that which is a comendement. And indeed those Priests of whom it is here spoken, seduced the people and corrupted the covenant, as it is said in the next verse.

They also alledge, that Iesus Christ in the sixteenth of Saint Mathew, promised that the gates of hell should not preuaile against the Church: but there he speaks not of any particular Church, nor of Rome, neither yet of the vniuersall visible Church; which although the power of the diuell cannot utterly abolish it, yet he often preuaileth against it diuers wayes, corrupting some by vices, seducing others by heresies,

and dissipating many particular Churches by persecution. *The brast shall make warre with the Saints; and overcome them*, Apoc. 13. The Church lieth before the red Dragon, Apoc. 12. In that passage our Saviour speaketh of the Church of the elect, which cannot be seduced, nor deprivied of saluation by the temptations of the diuell, as Iesus Christ teacheth in the 13. of Saint *Marke*, saying: *For false Christs shall arise, and false Prophets; and shall shew signes and wonders to deceiue; if it were possible, the very elect.* Where, if he speake of the vniuer- all visible Church, his meaning is that Satan can neuer abolish it.

But specially our aduersaries make shew of the 15. verse of the third chapter of the first to *Timothie*, where the Church is called *the house of God, the pillar and ground of truth*. The abuse consists herein, that they take that which is but a discription of her dutie, to be an infallible perfection of the Church. The Apostle thereby teacheth vs, that the Church is established in this world to defend and support the truth; but saith not, that she cannot faile in her dutie. So false Churches are pillars and grounds of lies, but it followeth not from thence, that they can neuer turne to the truth. To thinke or esteeme that the truth of God is grounded vpon men, is to make mans authoritie firmer then Godstruth. On the contrary, the Apostle to the Ephesians the second chapter, saith, that *we are built vpon the foundation of the Prophets and Apostles*: not vpon them as they were mortall men, but vpon their doctrine which endureth for ever. So the ancient Fathers vnderstand it. *Crysostome* in the eleuenth homilie vpon the first to *Timothy* saith, *The truth is the pillar and ground of the Church*. And *Irenaeus* in the first chapter of his third booke saith, *They haue left vs the Gospel in the Scriptures to be a pillar and ground of our faith*.

Our aduersaries themselves say it without thinking thereon, as often as they ground the authority of the Church vpon this and other such like places: for thereby they silently confesse, that the authoritie of the Church is grounded vpon the Scriptures; and so (not knowing it) dispute against themselves. And it is certaine, that whosoever groundeth the authority

is id dda
dei iudicatus
et vultus ei
spatium.
Euangelium
in Scripturis
nobis tradidit
vultus, funda-
mentum et
columnam fi-
dei nostra su-
peram.

thority of the Scriptures vpon the authority of the Church, becaueth the Church of the meanes to ground her authoritie vpon the Scriptures, and neuer ought to alledge the Scripture for a ground of the Church. He that buildeth the walles vpon the foundation, supposeth that the foundation is not grounded vpon the walles: So if the Church be the foundation of the word of God, it is not grounded vpon the word of God. Why then do they ground the authority of the Romaine Church vpon this passage?

Now after all this, if it were granted vnto them, that the word of God is grounded vpon the Church, they haue gotten nothing, if they do not also proue that this Church is the Romaine rather then the Greeke or Syrian Churches, which are ancients then the Romaine, and purer, and also boast of the succession of Saint *Peter*.

They also to the same end apply the words of our Lord in the sixteenth of Saint *Iohn*, verse 13. *Howbeit when he is come, which is the Spirit of truth, he will leade you into all truth:* This promise properly belongeth to the Apostles, whereof they haue receiued the full accomplishment vpon the day of Pentecost, when the holy Ghost descended vpon them and taught them all the truth of the doctrine of saluation. And albeit this promise should appertain vnto the Church, and should be perpetuall to all ages, yet the infalliblenesse of the Church is not thereby proued, much lesse the infalliblenesse of any particular Church.

They also alledge the passage of the eighteenth of *S. Matthew*: *If thy brother trespass against thee, tell it vnto the Church; and if he refuse to heare the Church, let him be vnto thee as an heathen man or a Publican.*: but this place shall be examined hereafter when *M. Arnaux* objects it against vs.

For the infalliblenesse of the Romish Church, they alledge that Iesus Christ said to *S. Peter* Luke 32. 27. *Simon, Simon, behold Satan hath desired you, to winnow you as wheate, but I haue prayed for thee that thy faith faile not.* Marke that two lines after, he foresheweth to *Peter* that he should deny him three times. Whence it appeareth, by those words Iesus pre-

Math. 16.
Acs 3.

pareth him against the temptation, and promiseth not to forsake him, nor to suffer his faith to faile. Which is euident, for that by the word *faith*, he vnderstandeth not the doctrine, but the trust and confidence in Iesus Christ: and by the word *faile*, he vnderstandeth not to erre in doctrine, but to faile by weakenesse. But what makes that for the Romish Church? doth all that is said to S. Peter, or that is said by S. Peter, belong to the Pope? as, *Get behind me Satan: and Silver and gold haue I none. &c.* or when Iesus Christ sent Peter with his companions to preach without scrip, money, or any provision? Luke 9.

II Ser.

Also to the Galatians 2.1. *Then foureteene yeares after I went up againe to Ierusalem with Barnabas, and tooke with me Titus also, and I went up by reuelation, and declared to them that Gospell which I preached among the Gentiles: but particularly to them that were the chiefe, lest by any meanes I should run or had run in vaine. Behold also S. Paul, as well as S. Peter, who formally both by example and words condemne the interior perswasion of the holy Ghost. He receiued his Gospell from the Sonne of God, and is well assured that it is canonicall, neuertheless he taketh not that for a rule, that the holy Spirit truly perswadeth him therunto, but rather the iudgement of the Apostolicke colledge, and had a reuelation that he should go vnto them, and feareth to run in vaine if he doth it not.*

MOVLIN.

Gal. 1. 12.

It is false that in this place Saint Paul condemneth the interior perswasion of the holy Ghost, and I am abash'd how it is possible that a man which maketh profession to teach Diuinitie, dares deny that Saint Paul was led by an interior perswasion of the holy Ghost. For in Acts 13. 9. it is said, that Paul was filled with the holy Ghost: and a little before in the passage which M. Arnoux alledgeth, the Apostle saith that he had receiued the Gospell by reuelation from Iesus Christ, which could not be, vnlesse Iesus Christ inwardly touched his heart by his holy Spirit, therein to imprint the doctrine of saluation. Saint Peter in the first chapter of his first Epistle saith,

saith, that the Apostles preached the Gospell by the power of the holy Ghost. In the sixteenth of the Acts the holy Ghost forbiddeth *S. Paul* to preach the Gospell in Asia. And if *S. Paul* tooke not the perswasion of the holy Ghost for a rule, but accepted the iudgement of the Apostolicke colledge, we must say, that he preached three yeares without rule, seeing that he had no conference with any of the Apostles till three yeares after his conuersion, Gal. 1. 17. 18. where *S. Paul* saith, that when it pleased God to reueale his Sonne vnto him, he returned not againe vnto Ierusalem to those that had bene Apostles before him, but went into Arabia. Three yeares after he went to Ierusalem to conferre with the Apostles, not to receiue or take any rule which he had not before, but to the end that this conference might be a publicke profession of concordance, without the which he and the other Apostles had runne in vaine, and their labour had bene fruitlesse. Not that I am of opinion that any man at this day may take *Saint Pauls* example therein for a rule, to dispence with himselfe for a certaine time from conferring and communicating with his brethren, vnder pretence or shadow of particular inspiration: for *Saint Paul* had gifts and prerogatives, which no man at this day may vsurpe without great presumption.

ARNOVX.

To be short, is it possible that the Spirit of God should be more assuredly in the heart of enery particular person, then in the whole Church wherein it resideth, and worke by this common agreement and consent? 12. Sect.

MOVLIN.

The aduersarie in these words makes vs say that which we do not beleue. Let those that bele. ue it answer him: & in the meane time let him procure those parties whereof the vniuersall visible Church at this day is cōposed, as the Greeke, the Syrian, the Affrican, and the Romane Churches, to agree together, before they can pronounce an assured and true iudgement.

ment. And for the rest no man denieth that in an orthodox all Church we must giue more credit to the iudgement of the Pastors and Ministers assembled together, then to a particular mans iudgement.

THE FIFTH ARTICLE:

Of the Confession of the Faith.

Of the perfection of the Scriptures, and of Traditions.

We beleue that the word contained in those bookes, proceedeth from God, from whom onely it hath authoritie, and not from men. And for that it is the rule of all truth, containing all that which is necessary for the seruice of God and our saluation, it is not lawfull for men, no nor for Angels, to adde vnto, diminish from, or to change the same. From whence it followeth, that neither antiquitie, custome, multitude, wisedome of men, iudgements, sentences, edicts, decrees, Councels, visions, nor miracles, ought to be opposed against the same holy Scripture; but on the contrary, all things ought to be examined, regulated, and reformed by the same: and therefore we allow the three symboles, the Creed of the Apostles, of Nice, and of *Athanasius*, because they are conformable to the word of God.

ARNOV.

13. Scil.

This utterly excludeth the vnwritten word of God, which we call traditions, & induceth vs to beleene nothing at all but that only which is distinctly contained and set downe in the Scriptures; and

to make vs renounce and reiect all Antiquitie, Councils, decisions, interpretations of Doctors, observations and customes of the Church; and so prepare and make vs docible to all the glosses which a Minister shall make upon the Scripture according to his particular sence. To be short, it is not strictly to observe the Scriptures, but by their proper senses and glosses to cover and defend themselves against the sence of the Church, which onely can deliuer vnto vs both the letter and the sence of the holy Scripture, whereof she is the inheritrice.

MOVLIN.

Will this man neuer deliuer nor set downe our Beleefe truly? For in all this speech, all whatsoever he alledgeth to be said by vs, is cleane contrary to that which we beleue, and is contained in this fifth article. It is false, that we beleue nothing but that which is distinctly set downe in the holy Scriptures: for we beleue many things which are not found distinctly nor in so many words in the Scripture, but are therein set downe in euivalent words, and by consequence necessary: As that the Church of God shall continue for ever: That God by his prouidence governeth all things: That in the diuine essence there is a Trinitie of persons: and diuers such propositions which are easily proued by the Scriptures, although they are not found there in so many precise words: in the same manner that *Apollos* proued by the Scripture, that *Iesus* Acts 18. was that *Christ*, although it be not distinctly and in so many syllables found therein. For if we must receiue no more but that which is distinctly in so many words contained in the Scripture, no man should be bound to beleue in *Iesus Christ*; for in the Scripture it is not said, that *Charles* or *Henry* ought to beleue in *Iesus Christ*: onely there all men are commanded to beleue in *Iesus Christ*. From whence the dutie of particular men to beleue in *Iesus Christ*, by consequence is drawne. It is false, that by this fifth Article we renounce all Antiquitie and Councils; for we onely say, that neither Antiquitie nor Councils ought to be opposed against the Scripture. It is false, that we would establish the glosses and interpretations of any particular Minister, as we haue shewed in the

the seventh and ninth Section.

Lastly, it is false that we reject Traditions; seeing that the Scripture it selfe is a Tradition: and that there are many things which concerne Ecclesiasticall policy and exterior order, which are not specified in the Scripture. We onely reject those traditions, which being received, it would thereupon follow, that the Scripture containeth not all the doctrine which is necessary to saluation.

Such is the vnwritten word, whereunto our aduersaries haue recourse when the Scripture faileth them; and that heape of humane traditions, which are equalised in authority with the holy Scriptures which we affirme to be the rule of all truth, and to containe all that which is necessary to saluation, and proue it by these passages. Saint Paul in the third chapter of the second Epistle to *Timothie*, verse 15. speaketh thus vnto his disciple, saying: *From thy infancy thou hast knowne the holy Scriptures, which are able to make thee wise vnto saluation, through the faith which is in Iesus Christ.* Then the holy Scriptures containe all that is necessary to saluation, seeing they can make vs wise vnto saluation by beleeuing in Iesus Christ. For what do we seeke for more, then to be wise in such manner, that we may be saued by beleeuing in that word which teacheth the faith in Iesus Christ?

Saint James saith of the same word, that it is able to saue our soules, James 1. 21.

Saint Paul in the first to the Corinthians cap. 4. 6. bounding or limiting the power of Pastors and their authority in the Church, saith, *Let no man presume above that which is written.*

The same Apostle in the twentieth of the Acts verse 27. saith, *For I haue kept nothing backe, but haue shewed you all the counsell of God.* Then it followeth evidently, that the traditions of Popes and of the Church of Rome, added from age to age since Saint Pauls time, are none of the counsels of God.

In the fourth of Deuteronom. verse 2. & in chap. 12. 31. God saith, *you shall not adde vnto the word which I command you, neither shall you diminish ought from it.* Then, if it was forbidden to the Jewes to adde any thing to Moses law, when there was

no other doctrine to saluation but that, there is no apparence that now at this day, the law of *Moses*, the Prophets, the Euangelists, and the writings of the Apostles, are not sufficient, and that it is allowable to adde traditions and an vnwritten word thereunto.

None of our aduersaries euer yet durst denie, that the doctrine of the Gospell is sufficient to saluation, and that the Gospell is not wholly & entirely set downe in the new Testament: otherwise, the title should be false, and we must change the title, and write *part of the Gospell*, and after seeke the other part in the vnwritten word. We must also change this word of *Testament*, which is set at the beginning, if that book be but a part of the Testament of the Sonne of God. And we must no more call those bookes canonicall, if they be no more the entire rules of our faith.

The Apostle Saint *Paul* to the Ephesians, chap. 2. 20. groundeth our faith vpon the Prophets and Apostles: *And are built (saith he) vpon the foundation of the Apostles and the Prophets.* If our faith be grounded vpon the vnwritten word, it must haue another ground then that of the Prophets and Apostles. For how should we know that this vnwritten word comes from the Apostles? But it is easie for vs to note the originall, the Authors, and the times of the most part of the traditions of the Church of Rome.

In the sixteenth of S. Luke, verse. 19. the wicked rich man prayeth *Abraham* to send one from the dead vnto his brethren, to warne them of their duties, lest they should fall into the like torment: to whom *Abraham* answered and said, *They haue Moses and the Prophets, let them heare them.* Which euidently sheweth, that they ought to content themselues with *Moses* and the Prophets, which the Church had in their hands, without expecting other reuelation.

In Esay cap. 8. 20. God reprobuing his people, because they sought to familiar spirits & vnto wilards, he sends them to the word contained in his Law: *To the Law, and to the testimony; if they speake not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them.*

In

In the Gal. chap. 1. 8. it is said; *But though we or an Angel from heauen preach vnto you otherwise then that which we haue preached vnto you let him be accursed.* Note that he saith *otherwise*; & not against that which we haue preached vnto you. Although it is to be vnderstood, that all doctrine in matter of saluation that is without, is also contrarie to the Scripture, seeing it is contrary to the prohibition to adde to the word of God, and that God forbids vs to teach mens precepts for doctrine, Mat. 15. 9. A little before that the Lord had condemned the Pharisees, because they transgressed the commandements of God by their traditions.

Whose traditions if they be considered, you shall find, that they were doctrines that commanded not things to be done that were expressly prohibited in the Law of God; but simply additions, and voluntarie deuotions out of the word of God; as to make cleane the outside of the platter, to wash their hands before they did eate with scrupulous deuotion; to tythe Mint and Cumin, to weare long garments, to fast three times a weeke, to make long prayers: to make conscience to heale a sicke man vpon the Sabbath day. Such also were the traditions touching the distinctions of holy daves, and abstinence from certaine kinds of meates, which said, *eate not, taste not, touch not*, Colos. 2. 16. 21. not vpon an opinion, that those meates were vncleane, but by voluntarie deuotion and humilitie of spirit, to tame the flesh, and not to care for the satisfying of the flesh, as the Apostle saith in the same place. Of all which traditions the Apostle in the same chapter, verse 8. saith, that it is *a vaine deceit, through the traditions of men.*

This onely thing (the vnwritten word,) which *Gregorie Nazianzen* calleth an *innotation not written*, and opposeth it against written pietie, manifestly discovereth the abuse. For some of the people may say, Where shall I find this vnwritten word? shall I find it in the mouth of my Vicar? What know I whether he erre? What know I whether he speaks according to the holy Scriptures, the reading whereof is forbidden vnto me? What know I whether he agree with others? seeing there

are

Greg. Naz. in
Epicadio A-
thanasi.
Hylaxor vlu
housior naru
vlt dyplo
anonymus.

are diuers contrarie Churches, that haue contrarie traditions? or if this vnwritten word be found in the mouth of the vniuerfall Church, how shall I get the vniuerfall Church together to heare it speake? If I must haue recourse to the ancient Church, how shall I reade so many Fathers, both of Latine & Greeke Councils, which my Vicar vnderstands not, & where in the wisest men are many times much puzzled? And yet I heare diuers men say, that the Fathers and ancient Councils are contrarie to the Church of Rome: and that there is not any one in the primitiue Churches that speaketh of the worshipping of Images, of forbidding the people the chalice, or the reading of the holy Scriptures: or of the odoracion of the host with Latria; of Romane Indulgences, of priuate Masses, of prayer that is not vnderstood by him that prayeth; of reading the Scripture to the people in a tongue which they vnderstand not; of the power of the Pope to giue and take away kingdomes at his pleasures, and to draw soules out of Purgatorie.

In all these things the truth is so strong, that M. *Arnouxe* in his answer passeth over condemnation of this Article, and agreeeth with vs that the holy Scripture is a sufficient rule of saluation, *because* (saith he) *it sendeth vs to the Church, and to that which the Pastors say.* Wherein he contradicteth himselfe: for to send to another place to seeke for rules, is not a signe of a sufficient rule. If the Scripture send to the Church to learne that which is not in the Scripture, by this sending she confesseth her imperfection. By the like reason I may say, that a man which cannot reade giues sufficient rules to learne Philosophie, when he sendeth or directeth one to a good Philosopher to be taught. I must adde hereunto, that when M. *Arnouxe* saith, that the Scripture sends vs to the Pastors, it presupposeth that it sends vs to those that are good and faithful: then we must first know how to discern them: but how should we discern them but by the rule propounded in the word of God? This doctor therefore manifestly mocketh those that are his audience, when he sends them to heare the Church and the Pastor, without telling them how, or by what

what meanes they shall discerne the good and orthodoxall Pastors from the wicked & hereticke, and the pure Church from the impure and hereticall.

The truth will yet appeare more evidently when we shall haue seene and examined vpon what passages of the Scripture our aduersaries ground their traditions. Iesus Christ (say they) in the 16. of Saint Iohn verse 12. saith, *I haue many things to say vnto you, but you cannot beare them now:* And thereupon they would make vs beleue (without prooffe) that those things which the Lord had yet to say, are the Traditions of the Church of Rome, as the Inuocation of Saints, the distinction of meates, the obseruation of feasts, the single life of Priests, the Popes succession in Saint *Peters* chaire as head of the Church, the priuate Masses, the drawing of soules out of Purgatorie, &c. This is a bold diuination, & for his owne profit. But there is no need to diuine, when Iesus Christ expoundeth himselfe: for in the verse following he declareth what those things were that he had yet to say, and which the holy Ghost should declare vnto them: which is, that the same Spirit should tell them *things to come*: which are those prophesies, which the Apostles afterward foreshewed, viz. that there should a sonne of perdition come, that should call himselfe God, and should worke wonders and miracles: that there should false Doctors come, that should teach men to abstaine from mariage and from meates: that there should one come that should be clothed in scarlet, that should seduce kings, and should haue his seate in the Citie that standeth vpon seven hilles.

They obiekt also, that Saint *Paul* hauing in his first Epistle and the 11. chapter to the Corinthians, propounded and set downe the forme and institution of the holy Supper, as he had receiued it from the Lord, in the 34. verse addeth: *Other things will I set in order when I come.* I answer, that it cannot without impietie be denied, that Iesus did institute the holy Supper as it ought to be, without omitting any thing of that which was necessarie: whereupon it followeth necessarily, that Saint *Paul* reserved vnto himselfe at his coming, the exterior

exterior order, and that which concerneth the decencie of the action. It is also by no meanes to be beleueed, that Saint *Paul*, after he had set downe the institution of the holy Sacrament, had an intent to mend it, and to contradict that which he himselfe had ordained. The things then which he referred for himselfe to ordaine, are not those things which the Church of Rome hath added to the Sacrament, whereby she ouerthroweth the Lords institution. For Iesus Christ did not lift vp the host, he commanded not the people to adore the sacrament: he offered nothing to God in sacrifice: & speaketh not of sacrificing, he gaue both kinds to all men, he spake in a tongue knowne to all: he asked not saluation of God for the mirits of the Saints whose bones were hidden vnder the altar: he turned his face to the people, and not his backe. To be short, he did all things cleane contrarie to that which the priest at this day doth. And such contrary inuentions to the institution of Iesus Christ, they call Apostolicall traditions; therein vsing the Gibeonites subtiltie, who coming but a little way, fained to come from a farre country: for they couer the new inuentions with the godly cloake of antiquitie, & vnder colour of adding, they change and correct the institution of the Lord. M. *Arnoux* will presently bring vs a passage for Traditions out of the second to the Thessalonians, chap. 2. which we will examine in his place. Now he proceedeth to scrape at the margent of our Confession.

ARNOUX.

Places or passages quoted in the margent of the Confession. John 14. Sect. 15. 11. These things haue I spoken vnto you, that my ioy might remaine in you, and that your ioy might be fulfilled. Doth he say more or lesse, that we must beleene nothing but that which is set downe in writing? doth he speake of any Scripture? To what purpose then is this text alledged, but for a shew, & to stand instead of proofe? Acts 20. 27. For I haue kept nothing backe, but haue shewed you all the counsell of God. It is Saint Paul that speaketh. Is there one onely word herein, that bandieth at that which is controuersed in the article? And if a Minister should say to his audience, I haue preached

preached the will of God vnto you, do you thinke that he would say that you shall beleene nothing but that which I haue written vnto you? so should we beleene nothing but the Epistles of Saint Paul which speake in the place which is quoted.

MOVLIN.

If those two places were ill quoted, yet the article of our Confession would neuertheless be firme, seeing it is proved by so many other passages which M. Arnoux dares not meddle withall. One onely place of the Scripture is sufficient to establish a doctrine: which cannot be ouerthrowne, but by confuting all the proofes whereupon it is grounded. So all that which M. Arnoux doth serueth to establish this Article of our Confession, seeing, that saying nothing against the other places that are quoted, he approueth them by his silence.

Neuertheless these two passages taken in the sence and to the end for the which we alledge them, will be found to be fitly applyed. By them we beate at the traditions that adde any doctrine which is not contained in the holy Scriptures: whereof our aduersaries themselues do set downe vnto vs the authours, and tell vs, that such and such a Pope added this peece to the Masse, that such and such a Pope that liued so many yeares since the Apostles times, made this order and decree, which was neuer practised before. Against that, we alledge the words of Iesus Christ, *These things haue I spoken vnto you that my ioy might remaine in you, & that your ioy might be fulfilled.* And that which Saint Paul saith to the Ephesians in the 20. of the Acts, *For I haue kept nothing backe, but haue shewed you all the counsell of Christ.* For if these additions, and new traditions of Popes, long since added, are necessarie to saluation, it is impossible that the ioy of the Apostles and of their disciples was accomplished: neither did the Apostles declare all the counsell of Christ. For that Saint Paul, by the counsell of Christ, manifestly vnderstandeth the Gospell. Now it were impietie to say, that the new Testament containeth but a part of the Gospell: for if that were so, the title should be false, and we must put a peece, or halfe of the Gospell,

pell, in the title. And to conclude, the Apostle in the very same place sheweth wherein the counsell of Christ consisteth: to wit, in repentance towards God, and faith in Iesus Christ: which are two points fully and amply taught in the holy Scriptures. By the way, I pray you note M. *Arnoux* eloquence, which speaketh of bandying of passages as if he were playing at tennice.

ARNOUX.

Contrary passages. 2. Thessalonians Chap. 2. 15. Therefore 15 Sell.
brethren, stand fast, and keepe the instructions (or traditions) which ye haue bene taught, either by word or by our Epistle. Upon which words in that place, Saint Iohn Chrysostome saith very well: By that it appeareth, that the Apostle did not teach all by his Epistles, neither set it downe in writing, but left diuers things by tradition, and will haue men to receiue and esteeme them all to be worthy of like credit: and therefore we stick to the traditions of the Church, and firmly beleene them; and when we are told that it is a tradition, we make no further enquirie nor question thereof. I am content with this text onely for my purpose, because it plainly sheweth vs, that we must beleene some thing that is not written.

MOVLIN.

The ordinarie manner both of old and new hereticke, is, that when the holy Scripture faileth them, they haue recourse to traditions. *Iosephus* in the thirteenth booke of Antiquities and eighteenth chapter, saith, that the Pharises had many observations by successiue tradition from their fathers, which are not written in the law of Moses. *Tertullian* become an hereticke in his booke of Monogamie, chapter 2. defendeth *Montanus* heresie, by these words of Iesus Christ: I haue yet many things to say vnto you, but you cannot beare them now. Which is the place that *Bellermin* produceth for traditions, in the fift chapter of the booke of the vnwritten word, cutting this passage according to his manner. For in the verse following, Iesus Christ declareth what those things were which they

Nippon *uolunt*
traditiones *is*
ecclesiasticas *in*
scriptis *non*
habent *sed*
in *oralibus*
traditionibus
seruari
solent.

Quia non
posset ex his
inueniri ve-
ritas ab his
qui nesciant
traditionem.
Non enim per
litteras tradi-
tam illam, sed
per viam
vocem
hinc ritinas
ta ex hinc in
scriptis in di-
stinctione autem
in tra alia
iudicantibus.

could not yet beare, that is, *things to come*, as the propheties touching future euents, which are found in the Epistles of the Apostles; and in the Reuelation; and not any other doctrines of faith. *Irenaeus* in the second chapter of his third booke saith, that *when men confuted heretikes by the Scripture, they began to accuse the Scriptures, saying, That the truth could not be found in the Scriptures by them that knew not the tradition, because it had not bene giuen by writting, but by word of mouth.* About twenty yeares after the death of Saint *Iohn*, one of his Disciples named *Papias*, Bishop of Hierapolis, beganne to hearken to vnwritten traditions, which were *parables* * and *strange doctrines*, and other *fabulous things*; as *Eusebius* writeth in the last chapter of the third booke of his historie.

These heretickes wanted not successors: the most fertile Church for traditions hath bene the Church of Rome: for that of a Bishop not worth fixe pence in substance, to make an earthly Monarch that exceedeth Emperours and Kings in wordly wealth, honour and riches, it was necessary to make great additions, and to patch long peeces to the ancient doctrine. And it is manifest in histories to be seene, that as the Bishop of Romes greatnesse increased, traditions were multiplied; which are much more recommended by our Adversaries then the holy Scriptures, and more religiously obserued. For in Rome adultery is permitted, but flesh is strictly forbidden to be eaten in Lent. The reading of the Bible prohibited, and Images erected in the Churches. Bishops dispence with the Apostles commandement, that will haue them not to be nouices, but fit to teach and instruct the people; for the most part of them preach not, and many Bishopricks are giuen to children. But touching Annates and reuenues belonging to the Papall Seate, those are inuiolably obserued. *Bellarmino* dares presume, and proceedes so farre, as to say; that *some traditions are greater touching the obseruation thereof, then some Scriptures*, chap. 7. of the booke of the vnwritten word.

Now we haue oftentimes desired to see a list of those traditions,

tions, and of that unwritten word reduced into one body, but our Aduersaries would neuer giue vs the catalogue thereof. Two things hinder them from it: The one is, that they know, that whatsoeuer they do, yet a wauering doctrine will hardly be firmly imprinted in the mindes and spirits of men, if it be not supported by Gods authority, speaking by the Prophets and Apostles. The other; that if they should deliver a list of those traditions to the common people, they would be abashed at their great number, and desire to compare them with the Scriptures, wherein they should find great contrarietie with diuers traditions: in such manner, that those traditions would rather be found to be corrections, vnder pretence of tradition. And which is more, there they should find traditions to be forbidden, Math. 15. 3. *Why do you also transgresse the commandment of God by your tradition?* And Colossians 2. 8. *Beware lest there be any man that spoile you through philosophie and vaine deceit, through the traditions of men.*

The abuse being therein so palpable, neuerthelesse M. Arnaux goeth about to ground traditions vpon the holy Scripture, therein contradicting the Church of Rome, which on the contrarie will haue the authoritie of the Scripture to be grounded vpon tradition. Whereby it followeth, that the authority of tradition cannot be grounded vpon the Scripture. To proue it, he allegeth the 15. verse of the second chapter of the second Epistle to the Thessalonians; *Therefore brethren, stand fast, and keepe the instructions (or traditions) which you haue bene taught, either by word or by our Epistle.* From this place our Aduersaries inferre; that beside the Epistle which Saint Paul wrote to the Thessalonians, he had told them many things by word of mouth; which we willingly grant: for, we take not vpon vs to maintaine, that the first Epistle to the Thessalonians containeth all the doctrine to saluation. Our difference is not, whether a short Epistle written by Saint Paul, but whether the old and the new Testaments do containe all that which is necessary to saluation. And which is more, if Saint Paul had said, *Stand fast and keepe the instructions which you haue bene taught, either by our word, or by*

the holy Scripture: yet it should not follow, that the things which he had said vnto them by word of mouth, and those that are written, were contrary things. A man may teach one selfe same doctrine diuers wayes.

Our Iesuite did well perceiue that this place was too weake for his purpose, and therefore he vnder-propt it with a place in *Chrysostome*, which he alledgeth otherwise then *Chrysostome* himselfe doth, wherein these words, *set downe in wrutting, Tradition, or the Apostle*, are not to be found. And all that which he setteth downe to be in the singular number, in *Chrysostome* is in the plurall number; yet I am content to receiue and allow of this place to be truly alledged.

*Cyprianus e.
pist. ad Pom-
peium, Unde
ista traditio
vtrumne de
Dominica &
Euangelica
authoritate?
See Augu-
stine in the 5.
booke of
Baptisme a-
gainst the
Donatists,
cap. 26.*

I say then, that when the Fathers speake reuerently of traditions, by the word *Tradition*, either they vnderstand the holy Scripture, which also is a tradition, that is, a doctrine left vnto vs: or, by traditions, they vnderstand observations touching Ecclesiasticall policie, and things which of their owne nature are not necessary; and which, for the greater part of them, are not now obserued by the church of Rome. Reade chap. 2. and 3. of *Tertullian* of the Souldiers Crowne; and Saint *Augustine* in the hundred and eightene Epistle, and the twenty seuen chapter of the booke of the holy Ghost, ascribed to *Basil*. Therein mention is made of diuers vnwritten traditions; and among others of being plunged three times one after the other into the water at Baptisme: To taste milke and hony at Baptisme in signe of concord: Not to wash our selues that day, nor all the weeke after: In euery action to make the signe of the Crosse vpon the forehead: To make conscience to fast on the Sunday: To pray standing from Easter to Pentecost: On cerraine dayes in the yeare to celebrate the passion, the resurrection, and the ascension of the Lord: To pray towards the East: The annoynting with oyle, and diuers such like traditions, whereof the most part are abolished, which wrongfully were termed Apostolicall, seeing that the Apostles neuer practised them, specially the custome to pray standing from Easter to Pentecost. For in Acts 20. 36. and 21. 5. Saint *Paul* prayed kneeling not many dayes before

before Pentecost, Acts 20. 16.

M. Arnoux could not haue bene ignorant herein, and had not alledged *Chrysostome* contrary to his meaning, if he had read the place it selfe in *Chrysostome* in stead of copying the same out of another. For he might haue seene, that vpon the same second chapter of the second to the Thessalonians, that Father hath these excellent words: *All those things that are in the holy Scriptures are right and cleare: all that which is necessarie, is therein cleare and manifest.* Then it followeth, that the traditions that are not in the Scripture, whereof he speaketh, are vnneccessarie things. And vpon the Psalme 95. * *When we say any thing without the Scripture, the auditories thoughts are vncertaine.* Our aduersaries object, that we receiue many vnwritten traditions, as the obseruation of the Sabbath day, baptisme of little children, and the perpetuall virginitie of the blessed virgine *Marie*. I answer, that the obseruation of the Sabbath day is found in the Acts, 20. 7. and in the first of Corinthians, 16. 2. and that the word, Sunday or the Lords day, is found in Apoc. 1. 10. And although it were not so, yet the perpetuall virginitie of the blessed virgine *Marie*, we beleue, more for decencie then for necessitie. As Saint *Basil* taught in his Sermon of the holy Natiuitie of Christ, where speaking of their opinion that hold the contrarie, he saith, that it is a thing which by no meanes preiudiceth the word of pietie. Touching the baptisme of little children, the Index of the Bible made by the Doctors of Louaine, and *Bellarmino* in the first booke of Baptisme, cap. 8. and diuers others, proue it by many places of the Scripture.

πάντα οὗτοι καὶ
ἰσθία τῶ πατρὸς
ταῖς διαιταῖς ὡς
παῖς, πάντα τὰ
ἀποστολικά ἴδια.

*ὅταν τις ἀρχαίον
ἀκούσῃ, ἢ διὰ
τοῦτο οὐκ ἀσφα-
λὴ ἐστὶν αὐτῷ.



ἡ ἀποστολικὴ παρά-
δοξις— τὸ ἐκ
τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ
τοῦ υἱοῦ ἵσταται
ἀποστολικὴν
μαρτυρίαν, ὅτι
οἱ οὐ μόνον τῶν
ἀποστόλων ἀλλὰ καὶ
τῶν ἐκκλησιαστικῶν
παιδευμένων
ἀνδρῶν, &c.

The iudgement of the ancient Fathers touching the
perfection of the holy Scriptures.

ARNOUX.

Saint *Augustine* in the second booke of Baptisme against the Do-
natists, c. 7. saith, *Many things are not found in the writings of the* 16. Sect.
Apostles, nor in those that followed them, neither in the Councils;

and yet because such things haue bene obserued, and holden by the Church, we beleue that they come from them, and are taught and commanded by them.

And note, that in the same place he prometh by this rule of tradition, that we ought not to rebaptize those that haue bene baptized by hereticks, which is an article of the faith, and no Ecclesiasticall practise.

Quam con-
suetudinem
credo ex Apo-
stolica tradi-
tione venien-
tem; sicut mul-
ta non inueni-
untur in literis
eorum, neque
in concilijs po-
steriorum. &
tamen quia
per vniuersam
custodimur
Ecclesiam, non
nisi ab ipse
tradita &
commendata
creduntur.

** Lib. 1. cap. 7.*
Ne videat hu-
manis argu-
mentis agere
ex Euangelio,
profero certa
documenta.

b Nondum
erat diligen-
ter, illa baptis-
mi questio
pertractata.

c Per solas
Scripturas po-
tes plenam
Dei intelligere
voluntatem.

MOVLIN.

This place is verie ill translated; these words of *S. Augustine*, *Neque in concilijs posteriorum*, are translated by our Iesuite; *Of those that followed them, nor in the Councils*. Wherein there is neither sence nor reason: and he turnes *commendata* into *commanded*. All this proceeds not from want of vnderstanding in the Latine tongue, but from trusting to another mans report. To vnderstand this place of *Saint Augustine*, you must know, that he disputeth against the Donatists, and maintaineth that we must not rebaptize those that haue bene baptized by hereticks: which custome he saith is not written in the Epistles of the Apostles; and yet in the same worke he defendeth it, ^a by many places in the Scriptures, which he saith are most certaine. Whereby it appeareth, that in this place, by *the things not written*, he vnderstandeth those things that are not in expresse termes in the Scripture, but are gathered by good consequence. As also that *Saint Augustine* placeth not this matter among the necessary points of saluation. For there he saith, ^b That this question was not yet well handled, or soundly cleared in *Saint Cyprians* time. Now is it credible that *Saint Cyprian* was wanting in something necessary to saluation.

To say that *Saint Augustine* beleueed, that the holy Scriptures contained not all that which is necessary to saluation, is a plaine confession that he neuer studied that Doctors workes.

In his Epistle 143. cap. 9. ^c he saith, *By the Scriptures onely thou maist fully and plainly know the will of God.*

In the second booke, of the merits of finnes, and of pardon,

pardon, cap. 36. he saith ^d When we dispute of a thing that is ver-
ry obscure, without the aide of the cleare and certaine instructions
of the diuine Scriptures, mans presumption must be limited.

And he himselfe against *Pesilians* letters, lib. 3. cap. 6. saith,
e *Reade this vnto vs from the Law, the Prophets, the Psalmes, the*
Gospell, and the writings of the Apostles, and we will beleene it.

In the second booke of Christian Doctrine, cap. 6. it is
said, f *In those things that are plainly set downe in the Scrip-*
tures, all things that containe faith and good manners are con-
tained.

The rest of the Fathers speake not otherwise. g *Saint Atha-*
nasius in the beginning of the prayer against the Gentiles
saith, *The holy Scriptures diuinely inspired, are sufficient to make*
men vnderstand the truth.

S. *Hierome* vpon the first chapter of the h *Prophet Aggee*,
saith, *Those things which men inuent of themselves, as it were by*
Apostolicall tradition, without the authoritie and witnesse of the
holy Scriptures, are confounded by God.

S. *Basil* speaketh excellently vpon that place, about the
end of his Ethickes or morall Philosophie, which are among
his *Alcetricques*. If (saith he) all that which is not of faith is sinne,
as the Apostle saith, and that faith commeth by hearing, and hea-
rings by the word of God, i all that which is without the Scripture,
diuinely inspired, not being of faith, is sinne.

If in things necessarie to saluation, these Doctores reiected
all traditions not contained in the holy Scripture, by greater
reason, after so many ages and continuance of time, there
is lesse apparence to make new additions. For when will
they cease from adding? *Bellarmino* in the third chapter a-
gainst k *Barkley*, seeing that the Popes power to dispose kings
is distitute of all ancient testimonie, saith, *That the Church*
in these latter times, hath yet power to constitute and or-
daine things that concerne faith and good manners. Where-

i *non vobis tunc dicimus quod in istis rebus, apostolica est. Edit. Basil. pag. 437.*

k *Non recte de Ecclesia Christi semit qui nihil admittit nisi quod expresse in veteri Ecclesia scriptum, aut factum esset legitt. Quasi Ecclesia posteriorum temporum, aut deserta esse Ecclesia, aut facultatem non habeat explicandi & declarandi, constituendi etiam & iubendi quae ad fidem & mores Christianos pertinent.*

et ubi de re ob-
seruissima dis-
putatur, non
adiuuantibus
diuinarum
Scripturarum
certis clarisq;
documentis, co-
hibere se debet
humana pre-
sumptio.

g *Legite hac*
nobis de lege,
de Prophetis,
&c. & credo-
mus.

f *In his qua*
aperte posita
sunt in Scrip-
tura inueniun-
tur illa omnia
que continent
fidem moresq;
viuendi.

h *aut aposto-*
licis et si in
diuina sui
scriptura non
est dicitur
et non scribitur.

i *Sed & alia*
que absq; au-
thoritate &
testimonijs
Scripturarum
quasi traditio-
ne apostolica
sponte reper-
unt atque con-
firmant, percun-
tit gladium dei

upon it followeth, that the religion of the Romish Church is not yet perfected, seeing that yet men may adde precepts touching faith and good manners thereunto. And the Bull *Exurge*, which is at the end of the last Councell of Latran, placeth this among *Luthers* heresies, that he said, *That it is not in the power of the Pope and the Church of Rome, to establish articles of the faith.*

ARNOVV.

1.7. *Sell.*

The same article lower. All things ought to be examined, ruled, and reformed, by, and according to the word of God.

True, according to the word of God, but how to be understood? Note that they pretend, that the sence by them giuen to the word of God, is the touchstone of all the trutbes of our beleefe. For otherwise, it is not to be doubted, that the word of God strengthened by the sence which the Church giueth thereunto, is the law, which neither can nor ought to be contested withall.

MOVLIN.

It is false, that we pretend that the sence which we giue to the word of God, should be the touchstone of all trutbes. None of vs calleth himselfe an infallible interpreter. We receiue no other interpretation of the word of God, then that which is drawne out of the word of God. So they are not found by vs, but by the word of God, which is infallible. And in such things as are clearly set downe in the Scripture, and that haue no need of interpretation, all doctrines necessarie to saluation are contained. By this meanes there is no need of an interpreter, in that sence whereby an interpreter at this day is vnderstood, that is, of such a one as giues his interpretations for lawes: such as the Pope and his Prelates say they are. Of which impietie, and how thereby guiltie persons make themselves iudges of the law, and seruants interpreters of their Maisters commandements; and how they alwayes interpret the Scriptures for their profit, and to serue for gaine, and what horrible and extravagant interpretations they make of the Scriptures, it hath bene formerly handled at large in the ninth Section.

ARNOVV.

ARNOUX.

Passages quoted in the margent of the Confession. 1. Cor. 11. 1. 2. 18. *Self.*
Be ye followers of me, even as I am of Christ. Now brethren, I commend you that you remember all my things, and keepe the ordinances as I deliuered them vnto you. And in the 23. verse, For I haue receiued of the Lord that which I also haue said vnto you. Do these two passages conclude the article for the which they are set downe as a proofe?

MOVLIN.

These two passages are wholly and altogether formall to proue that all things ought to be ruled and reformed by the holy Scripture. For here the Apostle to reforme the abuse which the Corinthians committed in the celebration of the Sacrament of the Lords Supper, draweth thē to the institution of the holy Supper, as it is written in the Gospell. It importeth not, whether all the foure Euangelists, or one part onely were then written: for alwaies this is certaine, that he reformeth the Corinthians by the rule contained in the Scriptures which we at this day haue.

By the way you must note, that *M. Arnoux* falsifieth the *M. Arnoux* words of Saint Paul, and putteth *I haue receiued of the Lord* falsification. *that which I haue said vnto you*, in stead of *that which I haue deliuered vnto you*: because these words *tradidit vobis*, quod tradidi vobis, shew that Saint Paul calleth a doctrine contained in the Scriptures, a tradition.

Of the authoritie of the Church, and whether she be the Judge of the Scriptures, and whether M. Arnoux hath reason to call the Scriptures a dumbe rule.

ARNOUX.

Contrary passages. Matthew 23. 2. and 3. The Scribes and Pharisees are set in Moses seate, all therefore whatsoever they bid you obserue, that obserue and do, but after their works do not: and Matthew 18. 17. Tell it vnto the Church, and if he refuse to heare the Church, let him be as an heathen man or a Publican. And in Deuteronomie

It is the 11.
verse. 2. 8.

teronomie, 17. 8. Thou shalt do all that that they shall tell thee, which preside in the place which the Lord hath chosen, and which they shall teach according to the Law, and thou shalt follow their sentence, without declining to the right hand or to the left. But he that by presumption will not obey the commandment of the Priest, which shall, for that time, be the Minister of thy God, and hath the sentence of a Iudge, that man shall die.

Now you must note by the second of Paralipomenon, chapter 19. verse 10. that iudgement and examination belongeth to the Priest, in all the foure chiefe controuersies, that is, when there was any question of the law of the ten Commandements, of morall commandements not set downe in the Law, of ceremoniall precepts for diuine worship, and of Iudiciall precepts for peace and iustice. Behold then, both the one and the other law (the iudgement of truth;) put into the hands of the Church established by God, and not left to the merie of their opinions which would abuse a dumbe rule, casting off the yoke of the interpreters that are ordained by God.

MOVLIN

By the passage of the three and twentieth of Saint Mathew, *M. Arnonx* letteth the Pastors of the church of Rome in the Pharasies place, and vnderstandeth, that although they say, and do not, and that their liues are contrary to their doctrines, yet men must obey them in all things, and do all that they command, because they haue the chaire and the ordinarie succession. I answer, that in that wherein he condemneth the actions of the Pastors of the Romish church, and compareth them to the Pharises, I will not contradi&ct him. But whereas he thinks it fit for vs to beleue the Pharises in all things, and to do all that which they say, without any exception, he contradi&cteth Iesus Christ, which reproched them, *that they transgressed the commandment of God by their tradition: and that they taught doctrines that are the precepts of men*, Mathew, 15. 3. 9. Therefore Iesus Christ, Math. 17. 11. hauing commanded his Disciples, *to beware of the leuen of the Pharises*, Saint Mathew declareth that they vnderstood, that Christ would haue them to beware of the doctrine of the Pharises.

There-

Therefore he would not haue them obeyed in all things. And is not that iudgement a manifest impietie and a diuellish doctrine, which they pronounced with one accord, in the ninth chapter of Saint Iohn, that *whoſoener confeſſed Ieſus Chriſt, ſhould be caſt out of the Synagogue*, that is, excommunicated? Was that a good doctrine, whereby *Caipha* the high Prielt and his adherents, pronounced Ieſus Chriſt to be a blaſphemer, and worthy of death? *Bellarmino* himſelfe acknowledged, that the Lord in the fiſt of Saint Mathew conſuted the peruerſe opinions of the Pharifies, that taught, that inward or ſecret cogitations were no ſinne. When Ieſus Chriſt ſaith, *Do all that they ſhall ſay vnto you*; he meaneth things conformable to the Law. And as *Chryſoſtome* in his ſeuentie two Homily vpon Saint Mathew (where he expoundeth this paſſage) ſaith, *All thoſe things that correct and amend manners*. And ſo the Ieſuite *Maldonat* vnderſtandeth the 23. of Saint Mathew. *M. Arnoux* addeth a place out of the ſeuenteenth of Deuteronomie, and the eleuenth verſe, which confirmeth that. For there God ſaith, *Thou ſhalt do all that they ſhall teach according to the Law*. Ieſus Chriſt meaneth not, that they ſhould be obeyed when they teach any thing againſt the Law. For the rule of the fourth of the Acts is without exception, *That we muſt not rather obey men then God*.

The ſecond paſſage alledged by *M. Arnoux*, is the eighteenth of Saint Mathew, where Ieſus Chriſt ſaith, *Tell it vnto the Church, and if he reſuſe to heare the Church, let him be vnto thee as a heathen man or a Publican*. From whence he inferreth, that in matters of doubt touching faith, we muſt go to the catholicke Romiſh Church, which is an inſallible Iudge.

I anſwer, that our Aduerſaries alledging this place, corrupt it three wayes; firſt, they ſay, that by this place Ieſus Chriſt eſtabliſheth the Church to be Iudge of the controuerſies in Religion, and of the points of faith. But there our Lord ſpeaketh not of points of faith, nor of doubts in religion, but of quarrels betweene two particular perſons; where-

Lib. 5. de a-
miſſ. gratia
& ſtatu pec-
cati cap. 10.

quædam ſcripta
in hoc ſe-
culi
ſcripta.

of the one hath offended the other : Iesus Christ speaketh of the censure of manners, and not of doctrine. *If* (saith he) *thy brother haue sinned against thee, &c.* To say, that if the Church haue authority to iudge of quarrels betweene two particular persons; by greater reason she hath authority to iudge of points of faith with authority and infallible certaintie; is to dispute with as good probability, as if I should say, that he that can carry a burthen that weigheth an hundred weight, by greater reason may carry a burthen of a thousand weight. Secondly they will, that by the word *Church* we must vnderstand the vniuersall Church: which is impossible; for, for to end a quarrell betweene two neighbours, we assemble not the vniuersall Church: we must go to a particular Church, which all men confesse to be subiect to erre, and namely, in that which is spoken of in this place, that is, in giuing admonitions, and vsing of censures; wherein faults are committed, either by passion or by ignorance. In the third place, they will that by the Church we must onely vnderstand the Romane, which is a rash supposition, without any colour. For if two Christians haue a quarrell in Syria, or in Echiopia, must they go to the Romane church to end their difference? And in doubts of faith, why should not the Syrian or the Greeke Churches as well be Iudges, which are much ancienter then the Romane, and haue Saint *Peters* chaire, and from whom the church of Rome hath receiued Christian religion? And the words of Church, of Priest, of Bishop, of Deane, of Baptisme, of Eucharist, and of Christian, that are Greeke, proue that the religion came from them from whom those termes are borrowed.

*Extra ad ludi-
dij.*

*Pontifex do-
bet dicere Ec-
clesia, id est,
sibi ipsi.*

Pope *Innocent* the third speaketh better, who in the chapter, *Nonis*, attribureth vnto himselfe the knowledge of the differences betweene *Philipp Augustus* King of France, and *Iohn* King of England, because it is said in the Gospell, *Dic Ecclesia*, as if by the Church, we must vnderstand the Pope himselfe. Which interpretation seemes good to *Bellarmino*, in the 2. booke of the authority of Councils, cap. 19. *The Pope* (saith he) *ought to tell it to the Church, that is, to himselfe.*

To

To these three so eminent corruptions of this passage, our Aduersaries adde two apparent kindes of iniustice: The first, that this place being one of those whereon they ground the authoritie of the Romish church, neuerthelesse the church of Rome will be the onely iudge of the sence of this place. In a cause where she is parry, and where her greatnesse and authoritie is to be decided, she will be absolute and infallible Iudge. By this meanes she will be sure to giue sentence with her selfe, and be well assured to win her cause.

The other iniustice is much worse: for when a question is made, to know the true orthodoxall Church, that men may follow it; the Romish church taketh all meanes possible from the people of knowing whether her Pastors teach the true doctrine, or not. For, to examine the doctrine of her Pastors by the holy Scriptures, is a thing not permitted to the people. To learne the resolutions of doubts by reading of the Greeke and Latine Fathers, (the length and multitude whereof is infinite) is a thing which the people vnderstand not. If we must be saued by that meanes, all women, and all the plaine country and vnlearned people are damned. So that to know whether the Church wherein we liue be a Church well grounded in the faith, there resteth no other meanes for the poore people, but to belecue their Pastors, who will be sure not to condemne themselves. Was there ever more horrible cruelty layed on mens consciences? Is not this a way to make the people, in a manner, desperately to play at hazard for their saluation, by following custome, and thrusting themselves in amongst a companie of blinde fellows, that follow and go on, without knowing any thing?

The third passage alledged by *M. Arnonix*, out of the seuerenteenth chapter of Deuteronomy, maketh for vs. For it commandeth to obey the Priests that teach according to the Law. If they teach otherwise, God will not haue men to belecue them. When Pope *John* the three and twentieth taught, that there was neither Paradise nor Hell, as it is said in the Councell of Constance: or when Pope *Honorius* main-
tained

tained the Monothelites heresie, for the which he was excommunicated by three vniuersall Councils. *M. Arnaux* would not haue men to beleeeue him in that.

Then he needed not to speake of the foure principall points of controuersie, whereof he saith the examination belongeth to the Priest: wherein neuerthelesse he wrongeth himselfe, to name morall comandements besides the Decalogue or ten comandements. The Doctors of the Roman church, (as well as we,) draw all the morall instructions and documents of good life and conuersation, from the Law of God. Let the Reader marke by the way the impious words of the Iesuite, when he termeth the holy Scripture to be a dumbe rule, vnder pretence that it hath neither mouth nor throat. Our aduersaries writings are farced with such injuries against the word of God. *Baile* the Iesuite, whose mouth *M. Riuet* hath perpetually stopt, in the first treatie of his Catechisme, saith, that *Without the authoritie of the Church, he would beleeue Saint Mathew no more then Titus Linius* a Pagan Author. *Bellarmino* compareth and equaliseth the testimony which the holy Scripture yeelds of it selfe to be diuine, to the testimony which the Alcoran of *Mahomet* giues of it selfe, to be descended from heauen. There also he saith, that the Scripture is but a peece of a rule. Doctor *Churton* in his third truth saith, that the Scripture is a two handed sword, and that by it men become Atheists. Thus one of them after another call the Scripture diuinely inspired, a dumbe rule, as if it were a wooden rule; which he durst not say of the Kings proclamations published and set on the posts, although the paper hath no voyce. And although the word of God contained in the Scriptures makes no sound in the paper, yet it hath a sound in the mouth of the Sonne of God, and of the Apostles, and when God published his Law in the middle of fire; which ought to haue the like force as if God at this day spake from heauen.

What? shall that commandement of God pronounced by his owne mouth. (Not to haue any other God but himselfe, and not to fall downe before or worship any image) be esteem-

med

*Bellarmin. li. de
verbo Dei non
scripso cap. 4.*

med a dumbe rule, vnder pretence that it is written? Yet herein it is cleane contrary to the images whereof *Dauid* speaketh, saying, that they haue mouthes and speake not. For it may be said of the Scriptures, that they haue no mouth, and yet they speake, seeing that they speake sufficiently, when they tell vs how God hath spoken, and when they teach vs to speake; as *Esay* saith in the 28. chapter and 20. verse, *If we speake not according to this word, it is because there is no light in vs.* The holy Scripture speaketh sufficiently, when it teacheth vs how we must speake. If it speaketh not, it is sufficient that it ruleth vs. Then it is great impietie to deny that the word of God is our Iudge, vnder pretence that the paper hath no sound. For that is not to bereaue the paper of the qualitie of a Iudge, but God himselfe the Author of that doctrine.

They serue their turnes also with another reason, to bereaue the holy Scripture of the title or office of a Iudge, by saying, that the Church is ancients than the Scriptures. If this reason be good, Magistrates could not be Iudges of the people; for the people are ancients than Magistrates; and the people should not be subiect to the Lawes, for they are ancients than the Lawes. Although diuers things contained in the holy Scriptures are found to be ancients than the Church: as all that which therein is said of the nature of God, of his properties, of his eternall counsels, and of the worke of the creation. For by the Scriptures we vnderstand not the paper and the print, but the doctrines therein contained.

But notwithstanding all these considerations, the ancient Fathers made no difficultie to acknowledge the Scriptures for Iudge. *Clement Alexandrinus* in the seuenth booke of *Tapistries* saith, *In the seeking out or the examination of things, we make the Scripture our Iudge.* And * *Opiatus Milenitanus* in the fift booke against *Parmenian*, saith, *We must seeke for Iudges. If they be Christians, they cannot be allowed on neither side, for afflictions kinder the truth. We must seeke a Iudge without. If he be a Pagan, he cannot vnderstand the mysteries of Christians. If he be a Iewe, he is an enemy to inquam,*

*autem ex his
non esset iudex
iustorum autem
propter apostri-*

** Querendi
sunt iudices.
Ergo in terris
de hac re nul-*

*lum poterit
reperi iudi-
cium, de celo
querendum est
iudex. Sed re
quid possu-
mus celum
cum habeo-
mus hic in E-
uangelio? to-
stamentum*

Christian

Christian baptism. If then we cannot finde any iudgement in this cause here on earth, we must seeke for a Iudge in heauen. But what needs we knocke at heauen gate, seeing we haue one here in the Gospell; that is, the Testament? Of which Gospell Iesus Christ himselfe saith, Iohn the 12. chapter and 48. verse: He that refuseth me, and receiueh not my words, hath one that iudgeth him, the word that I haue spoken, it shall iudge him in the last day. The Pope and his Prelates must passe by this iudgement; and shall be iudged by the same word whereof they say themselves are Iudges and infallible interpreters. Albeit Pope Innocent the third in the Bull *Ad liberandum*, which is at the end of the Councell of Larran, speakes as though he should be Iudge at the latter day, and signifieth vnto all those that would not go on the voyage into the East, nor contribute any thing towards the same, that they should answer for it vnto him at the terrible day of Iudgement. Reade Saint Augustine vpon that, in the eighteenth booke of Grace and Free will, where he will haue the Apostle to be Iudge, and to that end alledgeth a place out of the Apostle. And in the three and thirteenth chapter of the second booke of Marriage, and of Concupiscence, before he would alledge a place out of the Apostle, he vsed this preface: *Let the Apostle be Iudge with Christ, for Christ himselfe also speaketh by the Apostle.*

* Sed et in
ter nos index
Apostolus Io-
hannes, &c.
Iudex cum
Christo Apo-
stolus, quid in
Apostolo ipse
loquitur Chri-
stus

whether the Priests lips do infallibly keepe knowledge.

ARNOVL.

20. Ser.

The lips of the Priest keepe knowledge, and they shall seeke the law at his mouth, Malachie 2. 7. The law given is not a law, but in the mouth of the Priest.

MOVLIN.

In the Hebrew it is, *The Priests lips should keepe knowledge; which is not a prophesie, but a commandement. By these*

holy Scriptures: to the end that no man should be so simple to beleene that the words of the Priests and Bishops of Rome haue any force, vntlesse they be conformable to the holy Scriptures: for on the contrary, if we will beleene *Adi. Arroux*, this Scripture and the doctrine therein contained, takes their authority from the Priests and Bishops of Rome: which being granted, it is to be presumed, that God in acknowledging the kindnesse that he hath receiued from them, he will easily grant them libertie to clip the Law of God, and to patch thereto some peeces of their owne. As we see in our Ladies houses the commandments of God set downe in this manner: 1. *I am the Lord thy God, thou shalt not haue, nor worship any other God but me.* 2. *Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vaine.* 3. *Remember that thou keepst holy the Sabbath, and other holy dayes.* They haue taken away the second commandment, and in the fourth thrust in the obseruation of holy dayes. From thence also it followeth, that as the Law giuen by God, is not a rule but only in the Priests mouth: so, that which is in the Priests mouth, ceaseth not to be a law: although it be not found in the written word of God, which is that dumbe rule, and that peece of a rule. After that what more is to be done, but to take the Turban, or Turkish wreath?

Printed at
Paris by Hen-
reux Blannu-
lain in Saint
Victors Street
at the signe
of the three
Moors, an.
1611.

THE SIXTH ARTICLE:

Of the Confession of Faith.

This holy Scripture teacheth vs, that in this onely and simple diuine essence which we haue confessed, there are three persons, the Father, the Sonne, and the holy Ghost; the Father, the first cause, beginning, and originall of all things; the Sonne, his word and eternall wilddome; the holy Ghost, his vertue, power, & efficacy:

The

The Sonne eternally begotten of the Father, the holy Ghost eternally proceeding from them both. The three persons not confused, but distinguished, and yet not diuided, but of one essence, eternitie, power, and equalitie. And in that, we auouch the same that hath bene determined by ancient Councels, and detest all sects and heresies, which haue bene reiected by holy Doctors, as Saint *Hilarie*, St. *Cathanasius*, St. *Ambrose*, and St. *Cyril*.

THE SEVENTH ARTICLE.

We beleue that God in three persons working together by his power, wisdom, and incomprehensible goodnesse, hath created all things, not onely heauen and earth, and all that which is contained therein, but also the inuisible spirits, whereof some are fallen into viter perdition, the rest haue continued in obedience. That the first being corrupted and malicious, are enemies to all good, and by consequence of all the Church. The second hauing bene preserved by the grace of God, are ministers to glorifie the name of God, and to serue for the saluation of his elect.

THE EIGHTH ARTICLE.

We beleue, that he hath not onely created all things, but that he gouerneth and conducteth them, disposing and ordering all things that happen and are done in the world according to his will: not that he is the author of euill, or that the fault thereof can be im-

pured vnto him, seeing that his will is the soueraigne
and infallible rule of all right and equitie: but he hath
admirable meanes to be serued in such manner by the
diuels and the wicked, that he can turne the euill which
they do, (and whereof they are culpable) into good.
And so, confessing that nothing is done without the
prouidence of God, in humilitie we adore the se-
crets that are hidden from vs, without enquiring fur-
ther thereof then becometh vs. But rather apply that
vnto our vse which is shewed in the holy Scripture for
our repose and safetie. For that God to whom all
things are subiected, watcheth ouer vs with a paternall
care, so that not one haire shall fall from our heads
without his will: and in the meane time holdeth the
diuels and all our enemies bridled, in such manner that
they can do vs no harme, without his leave.

Mr. Arminius passing over these three articles, by his silence
declareth that he can say nothing to them. Neuerthelesse, in
another place he hath bene fencing against the doctrine con-
tained in the eight article: imposing vpon *Calvin* and vs,
that we make God the author of sinne, whereunto we haue
made answer in a Treatise apart by it selfe. But because this
matter is the field wherein our enemies display their banners,
and fall into odious exclamations; and for that this doctrine
is thorny, and where the way is slipperie, and the inuictees
plausible, it is necessarie to cleare the matter, to prevent the
slanders, and to vtangle this spindle, which *Sathans* malice
hath much twirled.

In the Treas-
ure of the iust
prouidence
of God.

*Of the providence of God, and how God conducteth the
actions of the wicked, without being author of sinne,
or participating with their vices.*

Three maximes or generall rules serue for the ground of this matter. The first is, that all things are gouerned and conducted by the providence of God: as Saint Paul saith, Ephes. 1. 11. *God worketh all things after the counsell of his owne will.* 21. Sect.

The second is, that God is soveraignly iust, and is not the author of sinne, neither inciteth men to do euill, as it is said in the 45. Psalm, and 7. verse: *Thou louest righteousness, and hatest wickednesse, &c.*

The third is, that man is the cause of his owne destruction, and that he sinneth by his owne will; as God saith by the Prophet, *Hosea 13. 9. O Israel, thou hast destroyed thy selfe, but in me is thine helpe.* Euen as in the generation of creatures celestiall causes worke with the inferiour: and if any imperfection happen, as when a monster is ingendred, that imperfection is neuer imputed to the celestiall, but to the inferior causes, and to the euill or bad disposition of the matter. So in voluntary actions, although God moueth and sustaineth them, neuertheless if any default happen, it ought to be imputed to the will of man, and not to God. Whosoever receiveth not these three maximes. defendeth the reprobate cause, casteth the cause of their destruction vpon God, and will teach God to be iust, or bind him to yeeld an accompt of his actions.

But the holy Scripture sometimes vseth phrases of speech, from whence prophane men take occasion to make God author of their sinne, as if God had thrust them into it, or as if necessitie to sin had bene imposed vpon them by the will of God, which man cannot withstand. For example, the children of *Iacob* by a wicked conspiracie sold their brother *Ioseph* to be carried into *Egypt*: whereof behold what *Ioseph* saith, *Genes. 45. 7. God sent me before you, to preserve you a posteritie in the earth, and to save your liues by a great deliuerance.*

Whereby it appeareth, that the selling of *Ioseph* was done by Gods providence. And in the first of *Sam.* 2. 25. it is said, *That the children of Ely hearkened not unto the voyces of their father, because the Lord would slay them.* And in the 25. Chapter of the 1. of *Kings*, 10. verse: *A wicked spirit came before the Lord, and offered to make the Prophets lie, to whom God said, thou shalt persuade them, and prevail also, go forth and do so.* In the second of *Samuel* Chapter 16. *Semei* curseth *Dauid* with execrable speeches, whereupon *Dauid* said, *So let him curse; because the Lord hath said unto him, curse Dauid.* And in the 12. Chapter of the same booke; God intending to punish the murder and adulterie committed by *Dauid*, said, that he would raise vp euill against him in his owne house, (that is, the rebellion of his owne sonne,) and that he would take his wiues before his eyes; and after addeth, *For thou didst it secretly, but I will do this thing before all Israel.* So God suffered the diuell to afflict *Iob*, and the Chaldeans to rob him of all his goods: and all that historie is recited as being done by the providence of God; and therefore *Iob* said, *God hath giuen, and God hath taken is, blessed be the name of the Lord.* *Jeremie* in his Lamentations 3. 37. speaketh thus of the desolation of the Iewes by the Babylonians: *Who is he that saith, and it cometh to passe, when the Lord commandeth it not? Out of the mouth of the most highest, proceedeth not euill and good?* Saint *Peter* in *Acts* 4. 28. speaking of the conspiracie of the Iewes, of *Herod* and of *Pontius Pilate*, against *Iesus Christ*, saith, they gathered themselues together to do those things which the hand and counsell of God had determined before to be done. Thereby shewing, that all the euils committed against *Iesus Christ*, were not done without the counsell of God. The Apostle Saint *Paul* in the first to the Romanes, speaking of prophane men and infidels, saith, that God gaue them vp to their hearts lusts, to vncleannesse, to vile affections, to a reprobate minde, to do those things that are not conuenient. And God declareth, *Exodus*. 10. and *Romans* 9. That he hardened *Pharaohs* heart. Gods words to the Prophet *Esay* in the 6. Chapter verse 10. are fearefull, saying, *Make the heart of this people fat, and make their eares heauie,*

and

and shut their eyes, lest they see with their eyes, and heare with their eares, and understand with their hearts, and conuert and be healed. Words, which being wrung and wrested by some prophane man, might giue him occasion to make God the cause of his infidelitie.

But lest that any man on the one side should abuse these places of Scripture, to brand the iustice of God, or to make him author of sinne, or to excuse libertines and prophane persons, as if God had constrained them to do euill; and lest that on the other side we should derogate any thing from the prouidence of God, esteeming that the wickednesse which man committeth happeneth without his prouidence, Diuines produce and set down certaine doctrines and distinctions, which are reduced into the sixteene propositions hereafter following.

1 The holy Scripture speaketh vnto vs of two sorts or kinds of the will of God, the one the commandement of God, the other, the decree of his prouidence. The first is the rule of his righteousness, which is manifested vnto vs; the second is the decree of his secret counsell. The first ruleth and gouerneth our thoughts, words, and works: the second disposeth and ordereth the euents of all things which happen and are done in the world. We are bound onely to obey the will of God, which is his Law, without enquiring, or making question of his secret decrees, and the determinations of his prouidence, Deut. 29. 29. The sonne that prayeth vnto God for the health and recouerie of his father that is sicke, doth a worke acceptable vnto God, and according to his commandement, although this prayer be contrary to Gods decree, and to his counsell whereby he hath decreed that his father shall die of that disease. The wicked are not excusable; for that in the execution of euill they haue serued Gods secret decree, which the diuels also execute: for we shall not be iudged according to that whereby we haue serued God in his secret decree, but according to the measure whereby we haue obeyed Gods commandements.

To speake properly, the decree of God onely, which is a determination of his prouidence, is the will of God. Touching

thing his commandments, they are rather a rule of righteousness, and a declaration of that which God approveth, and which man is bound vnto, then a will decreed or determined.

3. When we say, that the decrees of the counsell of God are hidden from vs, we must except those which God hath made manifest vnto vs by the execution and accomplishment thereof, and those that are declared vnto vs in the word of God, although they are not yet fulfilled: as the decrees of the counsell of God, touching the destruction of Antichrist, and of the resurrection and the judgement to come.

4. There are two sorts of euill, the one is the euill of the fault, the other is the euill of punishment. The first euill proceedeth from man, the second cometh from God that punisheth the finnes of men: neuertheless the euill of the fault sometimes serues for the euill of punishment, when God in his wrath withdraweth his grace and assistance from a man, because he abuseth it by ingratitude. And then that bridle and restraint being broken, men giue themselves ouer to vices which draw them into destruction. Then the euill of fault which serueth for a paine or punishment proceedeth not from God, as it is the euill of fault, or as it is sinne, but onely God maketh it serue for a punishment.

5. God permitteth or suffereth sinne. For if God would hinder man from sinning, he is powerfull enough to do it: as Saint Paul Rom. 9. 19. saith, *Who is he that can resist his will?* This permission is not a forcible but a voluntarie permission: no man hath constrained him to suffer sinne to enter into the world. He hath then purposed to permit euill. Now God willeth nothing but that which is good: Therefore it was good that God permitted euill, for those reasons which he knoweth better then we do. So then that which we perceiue thereby is, that by that meanes God is much more glorified: for if there were no sinne in the world, we should not know Gods iustice in punishing of sinne, nor his mercie in pardoning of sinne: and his infinite loue in the mystery of the incarnation of his Sonne had not bene revealed.

Not

Not that God hath any need of the finnes of men to maintaine his glorie and his beatitude: but I say, that God hauing determined to make man perfectly happie, by this permission of sinne the way to leade a man to this perfection is opened. For if man had not knowne what sinne and wickednesse is, he could neuer haue attained to a perfect knowledge of the goodnesse and iustice of God. Now the finall end for which all things are made, is, that God might be glorified: and withall the Scripture teaching vs that God punisheth one sinne by others finnes, if God onely permitted this punishment without willing it, that were not a punishment of a Iudge, who neuer punisheth by permitting the culpable to be punished, but by commanding: Looke, touching this punishing of one sinne by another sinne, in Saint *Augustine* lib. 3. cap. 3. against *Julian*.

6 There is none but God, that permitting euill can turne it into good: but men ought not to suffer or permit sinne, nor to do it, vpon hope that good may come thereof. The Pope that permitteth the stewes in Rome, to shun and preuent Sodomiticall sinne, as they say that seeke to excuse him, doth not remedie that euill; for Sodomiticall sinne ceaseth not to be common there. Adde hereunto, that the actions of God are not the rules of our life, but his Commandements.

7 The permission whereby God permitteth the wicked to sinne, is not a vaine or idle permission, but such as bridleth the wicked, to the end that they should not passe the limits of the prouidence of God, or to do hurt vnto those whom God will blesse and preserue. For although the will of man be corrupted, yet God hath not lost his power, whereby he guideth all things, and keepeth mens wils in subiection, euen of those that resist his knowne will, which is his commandement.

8 There are two principall faculties in the soule of man, the vnderstanding and the will; the one, whereby man knoweth; the other, whereby he moueto: the one, whereby we are wise or ignorant; the other whereby we are good or euill.

euill: That which in the vnderstanding is to affirme or deny, that in the will, is to desire or shunne. God neuer puts euill desires into the will of man; nor inciteth him to do euill, but sometimes in his wrath blindeth his vnderstanding. For as a master doth well to put out his scholers candle, when he seeth that he employeth the night in leudnesse, or to reade wicked bookes, so God taketh away the light of his knowledge from those that abuse it by ingratitude. As Saint Iohn, 12. 40 saith, *He hath blinded their eyes, and hardened their hearts, &c.* Now as it may happen to that scholer being without light, to stumble and to hurt himselfe, vnlesse his master guide him: so after God hath blinded the vnderstanding of any man, he falleth into vices, and addiceth his mind vnto euill, vnlesse God guide him. So we must vnderstand that which God saith in the Psal. 81. 12. *I gaue them vp vnto their owne hearts lusts, and they walked in their counsels.* Looke Acts 14. 16. and Rom. 1. 25. 26. It may also be said, that God hardeneth the hearts of the wicked, in setting before them meanes proper and wholsome for saluation, as his word and his sacraments; and not giuing them grace & power to serue him as they should, whereby it happeneth, that of themselves they waxe worse, God by that meanes punishing their perversitie. This hardening of the heart, which followeth by accident of the blinding of the vnderstanding, is the reason whereby the Scripture saith that God hardeneth the heart of the wicked. And yet to shew that the ground of this hardening proceedeth from man, the Scripture doth not onely say, that God hardened *Pharao*'s heart, but also that *Pharao* hardened or exasperated his owne heart, *Exod.* 8. 15. But there are two kinds of those whom God hardeneth, as also there are two kinds of hardening. For besides that hardening which is common to all reprobates that haue abused the knowledge of God, there are some men wickedder then others, whom God deliuereth to Satan by a particular iudgement, and an extraordinary manner, as *Pharao*, *Saul*, and *Judas*.

9. Euen as the Sunne is not the cause of darknesse, (for of his owne nature he produceth nothing but light) although dark-

darknesse necessarily succeedeth when it is gone downe: So God is not the cause of sinne; for of his nature he is righteousness it selfe, although irregularity, sinne, and disorder of affections necessarily ensue when he hath withdrawne his grace. Some say, that the Sunne withdrawing it selfe, is the cause of darknesse, not the efficient, but the defectiue cause: But these termes are harsh, and ought not to be attributed vnto God: as also that by this distinction a thing that is no more, (as a light put out) might be called a defectiue cause. Now that which is no more, can in no manner be a cause. But the absence thereof may well be a cause of the truth of some affirmation.

10 Although the wicked worke voluntarily of themselves, and without God being any cause of their sinne, yet the events that happen therby are directed by his prouidence. For, as the water of a spring, by nature is inclined to runne downeward, but by mans industrie is drained, and by channels made to runne where and which way he will: so the wicked are of themselves inclined to euill, and God motueth them not to do euill, but directeth their wicked wils to execute one thing rather than another, by his secret iudgement to punish those whom he will, and to exercise and trie his children. The Wise man in the 21. of the Prouerbs vseth this similitude, saying: *The Kings heart is in the hand of the Lord, as the riuers of waters, he turneth it whither soeuer he will.*

11 God slacketh or looseth the bridle to Satan and to the wicked, to execute their wicked intents, which proceed from themselves and not from God: neuerthelesse, all whatsoever they shall do, shall serue to effect the counsell of God: and as Saint Peter saith, *They shall do those things which the hand and the counsell of God had determined before,* Acts 5.

Euen as horseleaches applied to a mans body, intend nothing but to fill themselves with bloud; but the Phisitians end who applyeth them, is to heale his patient: So the wicked, by whom God serueth his turne to chasten his children, haue no other end, but to satisfie their inordinate lusts and desires: but God making them his instruments, hath a regard

gard to the saluation and instruction of his children. See *Essay* 10. 6. 7. Neuerthelesse God vseth the seruice of the wicked, in such manner that he constraineth not their wils, and taketh not from them their free choice, which in the wicked is most free to do euill.

12 As God is necessarily good, and yet most free and without constraint; so the diuell and those whom he governeth absolutely, are necessarily euill, and yet do euill without constraint, and with full libertie. Necessitie is not opposite to libertie, but constraint. Necessitie is so much the stronger, when it is voluntary. If man were driuen to do euill by a compulsive necessitie and not voluntary, God should be vniust to punish him.

13 We must carefully distinguish the action from the deprauation or imperfection which is in the action. It is one thing to go, and another thing to halt as we go. The soules which moueth a lame man maketh him go, but maketh him not halt. That which is naturall, as going, comes from the soule; that which is vicious, is accidentall, and proceedeth from some other thing: so the action whereby a man sinneth, is one thing, and the defect and deprauation in the action, another thing. There is great difference betweene the naturall mouing of the murtherer to kill, and the vice or repugnance to the Law of God which is in this action. That which is naturall in this action, proceedeth from God; *For by him we haue life, mouing, and being, &c.* Acts 17. 28. And we cannot stirre nor moue without his aide. That which therein is vicious comes from man, and not from God.

14 We must carefully distinguish these three things, the will to sinne, the execution of this will, and the euents which follow this execution. For example, in the selling of *Ioseph*, the treason and the crueltie was in the hearts of his brethren, & came from them, and not from God. The execution thereof, which is the selling of *Ioseph*, was also done by them, but directed by the providence of God. The euents that followed thereupon, as the exaltation of *Ioseph*, and the preservation of the people of Israel, are purely and simply effects of the providence

vidence of God. Herein there is nothing so easie as to calu-
mniolate, by interpreting that which some of vs shall haue
said of the execution, or of the euents after the execution: as
if his meaning were to speake of the will to sinne.

15 As in naturall workes or actions, God sustaineth and
moueth all creatures, not onely by a generall power, but al-
so by his particular assistance: So we must say, that to moue
mens wils to good, and to direct the wils of the wicked
to the end and intent that God hath purposed, God ruleth
and assisteth; not onely by his generall aide, but also by his
particular providence: seeing it appeareth that the effects
which follow, as the death of Iesus Christ happened by the
wickednesse of the Iewes, and the preservation of the peo-
ple of God by the selling of *Ioseph*, are things manifestly
guided by the speciall providence of God.

16 When God looseth the bridle to Satan to tempt man,
well may the diuell sollicit him, or present objects vnto him
to tempt him, or by some alteration of the humors of the bo-
die moue his fantasie, but he hath no power ouer the will of
man, to constraime him to sinne: otherwise, God should be
vnjust to punish man, and all the fault should be in the di-
uell.

Saint *Augustine* vseth hard termes in this matter, which
neverthelesse by the distinctions aforesaid may be mitiga-
ted. In the twentieth Chapter of *Grace and Free will*, spea-
king of *Semei* cursing *David*, vpon that which God had said
to *Semei*, Curse *David*: * God (saith he) did not commaund him
to do it, that his obedience might be praised, but because God,
by his iust iudgement did incline his will to that sinne, which
was euill by his owne fault. * And Chapter 21. God worketh
in the hearts of men, to incline their wils which way he will,
eitherto good by his mercie, or to euill according to their me-
rits.

And in the fifth booke against *Julian*, the third Chap-
ter, The perversitie of the heart cometh not without the se-
cret iudgement of God, which maketh men not to hearken to
the truth, and by that meanes they fall into sinne: and so, that

* Non enim
iubendo dixit
vbi obedientia
laudaretur,
sed quod eius
voluntatem
proprio vitio
malam, in hoc
peccatum iusto
suo iudicio ex-
oculto incli-
nauit.

* Operatur
Deus in cordi-
bus hominum
ad inclinan-
das eorum vo-
luntates quo-
cumq; volue-
rit, siue ad bo-
na pro sua mi-
sericordia, si-
ue ad mala pro
meritis eorum.

sinne

sinne is the punishment of precedent sinne. And a litle after, Then God giueth them over to villanous desires, to do things that are not comendment: but he giueth them iustly over, and so those finnes become punishments for finnes past, and merites for future paines.

Thomas Aquinas followed him, in his commentarie vpon the ninth to the Romans, the third Lecture: where after he hath said, that God suffereth some to fall into sinne, for punishment of precedent iniquities, he addeth: I am of opinion, that in this place there is more to be understood: that is, that by a certaine interior insinuation men are moued by God to good or euill. Therefore also Saint Augustine in his booke of Grace and Freewill saith, that God worketh in the hearts of men to incline their will which way it pleaseth him, whether it be to good, according to his merite, or to euill, according to their merits.

Belarmine is intollerable in the thirteenth Chapter of the second booke of Falling from grace, and the state of sin. The second meane (saith he) is, that we vnderstand that God moueth, and prouoketh some men to euill, or that he commendeth them to do euill, and that he useth them as instruments, because he suffereth them to do euill. And in the 14. Chapter. By the iudgement of God, punishing by precedent sinne, man is in such sort destitute of diuine aide, that it is impossible for him not to fall. After he expoundeth from whence this necessitie of falling cometh, that is (saith he) because God doth not call him nor moue him so, as he seeth him apt to follow God: calling him, that is, vouchsafeth him not congruent grace for him in this estate.

THE NINTH ARTICLE.

Of Freewill, and of naturall Corruption.

We beleeue that man hauing bene created pure,
entire,

entire, and conformable vnto the Image of God, by his owne fault fell from the grace that he had receiued, and so alienated himselfe from God, who is the fountaine of all righteousnesse and of all goodnesse, in such manner that his nature is wholly corrupted, and being blinded in his spirit, and depraued in his heart, hath lost all integritie, without any remainder thereof. And although he hath some knowledge to discerne good and euill, notwithstanding we say, that what light focuer he hath, it is turned into darknesse, if the question be of searching after God; insomuch that by his vnderstanding and reason, he can no way come neare him. And although that he hath a will, whereby he is moued to do this or that, yet it is wholly captiuated vnder sinne, in such sort, that he hath no libertie to do good, but that which God giueth him.

ARNOV.

It is one thing to say, that without the grace of God we can do no good, tending to life everlasting, and to the glorie of Iesus Christ; which is true; and another thing to say, that doing that good by the aide and motion of grace, we do it as being constrained, pressed, and drawne vnto it, without the vse of our owne Freewill: which is the scope of this Article, overthrowing the Image of God in man, (that is, libertie) and supplanting the grounds and foundations of vertuous and commendable actions. 22. Sect.

MOVLIN.

To speake in this manner, it is not to examine our Confession, but to forge another to striue against it, and so to make sport. For we beleene nothing of all that which he maketh vs to say, but detest the doctrine which he attributeth vnto vs. For in our ninth Article there is not one word of

of all that which he maketh vs to say. We say not, that we do good by constraint; we take not the libertie of mans will from him: we know that the good which the children of God do, they do it voluntarily, and without constraint. This is our beleefe.

Man is considered two wayes, either such as he is by nature, or such as he is after he is regenerated and led by the Spirit of God.

Touching man not regenerated, and such as he is by nature, see what the Scripture teacheth vs. Genesis 6. 5. God saith, that *Every imagination of the thoughts of mans heart is evil continually*; and, Gen. 8. 21. *The imagination of mans heart is evil from his youth*. Saint Paul to the Romanes 5. 12. saith, that *By our mens sinne entered into the world, and death by sinne, and so death went over all men; inasmuch as all have sinned*. And to the Ephesians, 2. 1. 5. he saith, that *We were dead in trespasses and sinnes*; and that *God hath quickened us*. Whereupon the Scripture calleth this changing into a better life, a second birth, Iohn 3. 3. and a regeneration by the incorruptible seed of the word of God, 1. Peter 1. 23. and a resurrection, Apocalyps 20. 6. The Apostle S. Paul, Corinthians 2. chap. 3. verse 5. saith, that *We are not sufficient of our selues to thinke any thing, as of our selues, but our sufficiency is of God*. Then, if we be incapable of our selues to thinke any good thing, how much more to do any good thing? The same Apostle in the 1. Corinthians chap. 2. verse 14. saith, that *The naturall man perceiveth not the things that are of the Spirit of God, for they are foolishnesse vnto him*. And Romanes 8. 7. *The wisdom of the flesh is enmitie against God, for it is not subiect to the Law of God, neither indeed can be*.

By these places and other such like, we proue that which our Confession saith, that mans nature is altogether corrupt, and that man is blind in his spirit, and corrupt in his heart.

To the which proofes we adde the places which say, that faith and the loue of God, and so be short, all vertues that are in vs pleasing to God, and all the good that we do, cometh not from vs, but are gifts of God: as it is said in the Ephesians,

Ephesians 2. 8, 9. *For by grace ye are saved through faith; and that not of your selves, it is the gift of God: not of works, lest any man should boast himselfe.* And Philippians 2. 13. *It is God which worketh in you both the will and the deed, even of his good pleasure.* So the Lord Mathew 16. 17. saith to Saint Peter: *Blessed art thou Simon the sonne of Ionas, for flesh and bloud hath not revealed it vnto thee, but my Father which is in heauen.* Therefore also in the 11. 25. he gaue thanks to his Father, for that he had hidden those things from the wise and men of vnderstanding, and had opened them vnto babes. From the same spring proceedeth the loue that we beare to God, 1. Iohn, chap. 4. 10. *We loue God, because he hath loued vs first.*

By all these prooves we intend not to take from the corrupt and vnregenerate man all freedome of will: we know well, that in naturall actions, which are ruled by the will, as to eate, and to go; and in ciuill actions, to sell, contract, build, and trauell, man freely chuseth among many obiects. Of this liberty in ciuill things, Saint Paul speaketh 1. Corinth. 7. where he saith, That the woman after the death of her husband is at libertie to marrie againe, and putteth it to the choyce of the father to let his daughter marrie or to keepe her a virgine. We say more, that is, that man hath his free will in good and honest actions, belonging to ciuill honesty: as the actions of Pagans, which helpe vp a man that is fallen downe, and set him in the way againe that hath lost his way. I say the same touching the obseruatiō of Ecclesiasticall policy, wherein the essence of pietie consisteth not; and of all good works, touching the exterior action, as to giue almes, sing to the praise of God, &c. And which is more, we say that the vnregenerate men sinneth very freely, and without constraint, and betweene two evils chuseth very freely. And this is the same liberty which imposeth on him the necessitie to sinne, because he is naturally subiect to his will, naturally euill. Therein consists his mischiefe, that he is too free to do euill, so that his freedome is the cause of his seruitude. Now this necessity to sinne is not repugnant to the freedome of the will. Witnesse the diuels, which are necessarily and naturally

G

wicked

wicked, and yet sinne most freely and without constraint: So God is necessarily good, and yet most free. It is not necessity but constraint that overthroweth the freedom of the will.

Rom. 7. 14.
Eph. 2. 1.

In all these things we say that vnregenerate men haue their free will and free choyce, onely the word of God be-
reaueth them of this libertie, and calleth them bondslaves, sold to sinne, yea dead in sinne, in regard of Christian vertues which leade men vnto saluation; as the true knowledge of God, and of faith in Iesus Christ, and of the true feare and loue of God, the end and purpose whereof is the glorie of God, and the hope of saluation in Iesus Christ. To all these things man naturally hath no inclination, no mouing, nor no free will at all, as we haue shewed by places of the Scripture. It should be hard in the good theefe crucified with Iesus Christ, or in the Apostle Saint Paul before his conuersion, to find any preparations or dispositions to conuert or turne vnto God: which preparations our Aduersaries call merits of congruittie: which surely is a great incongruittie in faith.

Touching the regenerate, and such as are conducted and sanctified by the Spirit of God, we are so farre off from saying that they do good by constraint, that on the contrary, we say that they do it willingly, and take pleasure therein. He that doth good by constraint, doth euill. And God sheweth mercy vnto him if he pardoneth such a disobedience. Although God hateth euill, yet he will not constrain men to goodnesse, because goodnesse is no goodnesse if it be not voluntary. But he boweth the wils of his children, and maketh them willing to worke with him. In such manner neuertheless, that all whatsoeuer they cooperate, and the will it selfe which they haue to do good, proceedeth from God: *Which worketh in vs both the will and the deed, euen of his good pleasure*, Phil. 2. 13. Euen as the infant formed in the wombe, stirreth of it selfe, and is an helpe to his owne conseruation and birth, & yet all that vigor or strength in him proceedeth from God: so is it with regeneration and spirituall birth. To giue
God

God all the praise and glory of our good workes, is not to hinder good works, no more then to giue God all the praise of the framing and birth of the child, is to hinder the birth of the child, or to diminish his vigour. God preuenteth those that will not, to make them will, and aideth those that will, that they may not will in vaine. He commandeth whatsoeuer he will, and doth that in vs which he commandeth: he doth it by a sweete efficacy, and by an attraction whichout constraint, whereof Iesus Christ speaketh, Ioh. 6. 44. *No man can come to me, except the Father which hath sent me draw him.* The Apostle Saint Paul Eph. 4. 24. saying, that *the new man is created after God vnto righteousness and true holiness*, calleth our regeneration a new creation. Now as in the creation, the imperative words of God were operative: so in our regeneration, his word is full of efficacie to transforme mens hearts. So when the Lord spake to the dead body of *Lazarus*, saying, *Lazarus come forth*; by those words he infused life into him againe. And as our Lord commanded the Iews to vnbind *Lazarus* bands wherewith he was bound, that he might be loose, so in the spirituall resurrection, he vnbindeth vs from the seruitude of Sinne, that we may serue him freely, and with a good will. This is that which our Confession saith, that man hath no freedome or will to do good, but that which God giueth him. Then it acknowledgeth a freedome or will in the faithfull, but that it is a gift of God: which freedome being opposed and crossed by the combat of concupiscences, increaseth as God augmenteth his graces, and as the worke of regeneration proceedeth in vs.

The summe of all that which is said before, is this, that the vnregenerate man hath free will in naturall things, in ciuill things, and in wicked things, but not in diuine things which leade to saluation. As for the regenerate man, the good that he doth, he doth it voluntarily and without constraint: and in this sence diuers ancient Fathers say, that the faithfull haue free will: but if by hauing free will, we vnderstand, that it should be in the free will of a man that is not regenerate to haue true faith, and to turne vnto God with hearty repentance, or

that the good which we do, and the faith in Iesus Christ, and the true knowledge of God, partly proceed from our naturall forces, or that before regeneration there are preparations, dispositions, and merits of congruity in man: (as Sophisters prattle,) We reiect that free will, as contrary to the word of God; and not onely say, that God vnbindeth our will which is restrained, but that he wholly giueth the will and the force of motion to do good. Our aduersaries themselves, saying that man can do no good without Gods assistance, deny free will: for he is not free to go, that cannot go except the bands that bind him be vnbound, and without being holden vp after he hath bene bound. They say, that in an vnregenerated man free will is bound and restrained: as much to the purpose, as if I should say, that a free man is a bond man. For how can the will be francke and free, if it be bound and restrained? Surely, he is not free, that being laid downe cannot rise againe if another man doth not lend him his hand. For the grace whereby God releueth vs is not in our disposition: God doth not onely sollicite our wils, by shewing objects, or by propounding reasons fit and proper to perswade, but also giueth the desire, and changeth the will. He doth with efficacy produce *to will and to do according to his good pleasure*. For if he changeth the hearts of his enemies, as the heart of *Esau*, Genes. 33. 4. and of *Saul* 1. Sam. 19. 23. and of the Egyptians, Psal. 105. 25. And if he holdeth the hearts of kings to encline them as he will, Prou. 21. 1. how much more doth he touch the hearts of his elect, to turne them vnto him with a voluntary conversion?

ARNOVE.

23. *Sa2.*

Places quoted in the margin of the Confession. Iohn. 1. 4. 5. In it was life, and that life was the light of men, and that light shineth in darknesse, and the darknesse comprehended it not. Is not this a mocking of the world, and an abusing of mens soules, to set downe this place, thereby to conclude that a man can do no good but by constraint, nor obey God by the freedom of a good will

MOVLIN.

MOVLIN.

I grant it: for we set not downe this place to proue that a man can do no good but by constraint, but to proue that man naturally abideth in darkenesse. This man forgeth errors, to strue and contend against them.

ARNOXX.

And are not sinners (by good reason) called darkenesse, because 24. Self. they refuse the light which is offered unto them?

MOVLIN.

Adde thereunto: And because that they are naturally plunged in darkenesse, not hauing any true knowledge of God by their owne nature.

ARNOXX.

Iohn 8. 37. Then if the Sonne make you free, you shall be free 25. Self. indeed. I conclude so the contrary. The Sonne hath freed vs; and therefore we are free. What do these men by this allegation; but provide armes so beate themselves with sinne, that they

MOVLIN.

I know not to whom this Doctor speaketh: he proueth by this place that we are free after that Iesus Christ hath made vs free. Who doubts that? and who euer denied it? The question is, whether we be bondslaves, and without free will; in things which appertaine to saluation, before we are freed by Iesus Christ. *M. ARNOXX* toucheth not that, but spends time in vnprofitable words.

Whether man by his free will, can chuse goodnesse.

ARNOXX.

Contrary passages. Deut. 30. 19. I call heauen and earth to record this day against you, that I haue set before you life and 26. Self. death,

death, blessing and cursing: therefore chuse life that thou and thy seed may live. Note this word chuse: can a man chuse without liberty, or by constraint?

M O V I N.

By this place the Iesuite disputeth not against vs, but against those that say, that we do good by constraint. Therefore those that beleue that, must answer him, and not we, who therein agree with the Church of Rome.

Our aduersaries haue vsed to produce this place, to proue that it is in our power to chuse good and to leaue euill: seeing that God saith, *chuse*: for (say they) God commandeth no impossible things. But they contradict themselves: for *M. Armon* said before, that man can do no good thing without the grace of God. Now this grace of God is not in our power: we beare not the keyes of his treasures. God giueth not his graces to every one, but to whom he will. Neuertheless, this commandment is giuen vnto all men, to chuse good, and to shun euill, and that to those that are not regenerated by the grace of the Spirit of God, euen to Pagans and infidels. Behold then, by the confession of our aduersaries, men that can not obey this commandment which is giuen vnto them, because they haue not the grace of God, without the which we can do no good, that tendeth to saluation.

That which maketh our aduersaries to confound one another, and not to vnderstand themselves, is a false presupposition which they make, that man by his free will can do all that which God commandeth: which is a maxime that we must banish out of Diuinitie. For God in the Gospell commandeth vs to haue faith in Iesus Christ, and yet Saint Paul, Ephesians 2.8. saith, *This faith cometh not from our selves, but it is a gift of God.* God by his Prophet, Ezekiel 18. 31. commandeth vs to make vs new hearts: but he himselfe by the same Prophet, 16. 26. declareth, that it is he that giueth a new heart and a new spirit, that taketh away the heart of stone, and giueth a heart of flesh. God in his Law speaketh to all men, for the Law is our naturall

naturall debt: and yet it is a thing granted by all men, that without being instructed in the word of God, it is impossible to accomplish it; and there are an infinite number of people to whom the word of God is not preached, who neuertheless are bound to accomplish the Law.

This prooffe is demonstratiue, that if by our free will we cannot dispose of the grace without the which we cannot obey God, nor do that good which serueth to saluation, that also by this free will we cannot obey God, nor do that good which serueth to saluation. Then let *M. Arnon* learne, that the Law of God is not a prooffe of our ability, but of our duty; and that he which asketh a man that which he oweth him, is not vnjust, although the debtor be become vnable by his owne fault. And if the debtor be become poore by his owne prodigalitie, yet thereby he is not lesse bound to pay: and the creditor that will be payd, considers him not as rich or poore, but as a debtor. So it is in this case, for God had created man righteous, and by his free will able to chuse good or euill. By his owne fall he hath lost this righteousness, and by bad vsing of his free will, lost both it and himselfe. So that if by his owne fault he is become vnable to fulfill the Law of God, is God vnjust to aske him that which he oweth? seeing that God commanding him to keepe the Law, speaketh not to him as to a righteous man, nor as to a sinner, but simply as to a naturall man, bound to this obedience.

In which rigour the mercy of God is admirable. For in exacting from a corrupt man, a perfect righteousness which he cannot accomplish, he maketh him afraid, and by this feare driues him to Iesus Christ, who hath payd this debt for all those that belecue in him. God asking vs that which we cannot do, teacheth vs what we should aske him, and that which Christ Iesus hath done for vs. *Quid Deo impetras, fides impetrat.* That which the Law commandeth, faith obtaineth of the goodnesse of God by prayer.

*Aug. Enchir.
ad Laurentiū
cap. 30. Libero
arbitrio homo
male utens, se
perdidit, &
ipsum, nam cū
libero peccaretur
arbitrio,
vixit peccato,
amissum est
liberum arbitrium.*

Aug. Ep. 89.

To Philemon verse 14. I would do nothing without thy mind, 27. Sect.

that thy benefit should not be as it were of necessity, but as willingly. Note this last as, to be added for the pleasure of the Ministers. In the original you have simply and without constraint, willingly; but that importeth not much: seeing that this word restraineth not, but expresseth the manner, that Saint Paul requireth to be observed in the good action of his disciple, which is freedom and liberty.

MOVLIN.

We hold with *M. Arnoux*, that the good which Saint Paul required of *Philemon*, ought simply to be voluntary, and without constraint. The word *as*, added in our translation, is not contrary to that, but we were forced to adde the same, to shun an harshnesse of phraise, which the French tongue cannot beare: as for example, if the Apostle had said in the Greeke, that Iesus Christ suffered not as God, but man, he translateth truly that faith, Iesus suffered not as God; but as man. If I should say, that a French man ought to be apparelled, not as the Spaniards, but the French men, I should speake against our manner of speech, and must necessarily adde therunto, *as*, and say as the French men. And therefore whereas *Paul* according to the Greeke faith, to the end that thy good should not be as by constraint, but voluntary, it was necessary in French to translate, but as voluntary. *M. Arnoux* himselfe iustificeth vs, saying, that it importeth not much.

ARNOUX.

28. Self.

I could quote an hundred and an hundred places wherewith the Scripture sheweth, to iustifie this truth; without which, hell, Paradise, the preaching of the word, the exhortations, threatenings, and all that which we beleene of the efficacie of the grace whereby God disposeth of vs with an full obseruance, and maketh vs worke effectually; but yet mildly drawing vs without violence, were in vaine.

MOVLIN.

All that is good against those that hold that we do no good but by constraint, but not against vs, which onely say, that God vseth the preaching of the Gospell, and exhortations

tions and threatnings, with efficacy to touch our hearts, that voluntarily and without constraint they might be moued to serue him.

THE TENTH ARTICLE.

We beleene that all the generation of *Adam* is infected with this contagion, which is originall sinne, and an hereditarie vice, and not onely an imitation as the Pelagians say, whose errors we detest, and thinke it not necessarie to inquire how sinne comes from one man to another, because it is certaine, that that which God gaue him, was not for himselfe onely, bur for all his generation: and so, that in him we haue bene bereaued of all goodnesse, and are fallen into all pouertie and malediction.

M. Arnonx alloweth this article, and findeth nothing therein to be reprobued.

THE ELEVENTH ARTICLE.

Vpon which M. Arnonx moueth the question, touching originall sinne after Baptisme.

We beleue that this vice is certainly sinne, which is sufficient to condemne all mankind, even little children, as sonne as they come out of their mothers wombe; and that it is so reputed before God, namely, that after Baptisme it is alwayes sinne, as touching the fault, although the condemnation is abolished in the children

children of God, not imputing the same vnto them by his free mercy, as also that it is a peruersitie alwayes producing fruits of malice and rebellion, such as that the most holiest (although they strue against it) are not without spots of infirmities and faults, while they are here on earth.

ARNOV.

89. *Sol.*

Can there be any thing said more contrarie to the mystrie of our redemption, and the greatnesse of the Sacraments of the new Law, for that both the one and the other are made of no effect? If the Sonne of God by his death, which by Baptisme is applied vnto vs, was not of force to withdraw vs from the death of sinne, but hath left vs buried in the filthinesse of the old man, and hath not truly regenerated vs, nor made vs acceptable to his Father, before whom we are still abominable, while the fault for the which his Sonne died remaineth in vs and defileth vs.

MOVLIN.

All these words tend to shew, that all those that are baptized haue no more originall sinne, and by consequence haue no more actuall sinne: for all our wicked actions proceed from our corrupt nature.

This matter is of great importance. For the knowledge of the corruption of our nature, maketh vs know the necessitie of the grace of God. If we did not know what euill it is to be borne in *Adam*, we should not know what good it is to be borne againe in Iesus Christ. We must necessarily know the miserie of our naturall generation, before we proceed to our spirituall regeneration.

This naturall corruption is called originall sinne, because we haue it from our birth. This sinne is an hereditary euill, which consisteth in the deprivation of originall righteousness, and in an inclination to euill. This corruption is fallen vpon man by propagation, and is come vpon vs from our first father, whose transgression is imputed to all mankind, because

because *Adam* did not sinne as a particular man, but as representing all humane kind, both in his beginning and originall. The benefits which he had received for himselfe and his posteritie, he lost for himselfe and his posterity. The crime of treason committed by the father, disparageth also his posteritie. And by all humane lawes, children are charged with their fathers debt. But herein there is a difference, that for debts children may renounce their patrimonie, but men can not renounce this hereditary corruption, because originall sin is not onely a debt, but also an hereditary contagion and disease: as when a leprosie seizeth vpon a whole generation.

Circumcision in the old Testament, and Baptisme in the new Testament, are silent confessions of originall sinne: for by these sacraments conferred to little children, the Church confesseth, that there is some superfluous thing in them to cut off, and that they are borne into the world with spots and filthinesse: the which they desire to haue washed away by the grace of God in Iesus Christ.

Because of this originall sinne, children are subiect to die although they haue not actually sinned: euen as we breake the egges of Aspes, although they neuer hit nor infected any man, because that out of them there would come venomous serpents; so a child dieth iustly, although it hath not actually sinned: but it is sufficient that his nature is vicious, and will one day disclose and bring forth sinne, which is there alreadie in power, and in his originall. For originall sinne is the ground of all actual sinnes: that is it which maketh man by nature incapable to obey the law of God. *David* confesseth that he was conceived in that sinne, Psalme 51. And our aduersaries confesse, that Saint *Paul* the Apostle acknowledgeth, that that sinne remained in him, Rom. 7. 17. With this corruption not onely the children of pagans and infidels, but also the children of the faithfull and true Christians are borne: because they beget children not as they are faithfull, but as they are men. Pietie is not hereditarie, it comes not by nature but by grace: it is not generation but regeneration that makes the faithfull. So vnder the law, a circumcised

sed man begat a child with the foreskin : in the same manner that graine of corne which is cleane, bringeth forth other corne with the huske and straw. If any man hath vicious children, he ought in them to acknowledge his owne nature ; if he hath wife and vertuous children, he ought in them to acknowledge the worke of God. That is it which Saint Iohn teacheth vs, 1. cha. 13. where he saith, *That those that beleene in Iesus Christ, are not borne of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God.*

God furnisheth his elect with a double remedy or helpe gainst this originall sinne; The one, is the remission of all our sins by Iesus Christ; the other is the regeneration and interior renewing by the holy Ghost : which changing is another birth, and a conformation of a new man, made according to the image of the Sonne of God. Of these two benefits Baptisme is a seale, by the which the benefit Iesus Christ is applied vnto vs : as Saint *Marke* in the beginning of his Gospell teacheth vs, where he saith, *Saint Iohn preached the baptisme of repentance, for remission of sinnes* : ioyning these two benefits to baptisme, to wit, repentance, which is regeneration ; with the remission of sinnes.

Whereupon we are at difference with the Church of Rome : in that she saith, that children that are baptized haue no more originall sinne, and that Baptisme wholly aboliseth that sinne. We one the contrary say, that children that are baptized, are yet spotted with that sinne, but that God impureth it not, but pardoneth it for Iesus Christs sake ; whereof the benefit is applied vnto vs by Baptisme.

Our doctrine is grounded vpon the holy Scriptures, vpon the nature of God, vpon experience, and vpon the confession of the aduersaries.

In the fiftie one Psalm and fift verse, the Prophet *David* confessing his sinnes, acknowledgeth from whence this euill hapned vnto him, that is, from his originall corruption, saying, *Behold, I was shaped in iniquitie, and in sinne did my mother conceiue me.* Now *David* was circumcised, and then circumcision was in place of Baptisme.

2 The Apostle Saint *Paul* was baptized and regenerated. Now our Adversaries confesse, that in the seventh chapter to the Romanes he speaketh of himselfe, and that in the seventeenth verse he acknowledgeth, that *Sinne dwelleth in him*. And in the foureteenth verse, *I am carnall sold vnder sinne*. The Councell of Trent, in the fift Session, holdeth that Saint *Paul* speaketh of the regenerate man. Behold then a man baptized and regenerate, in whom (by the confession of our Adversaries) sinne dwelt, and that yet had naturall corruption in him; which did in such manner torment the Fathers in the Councell of Trent, that they found no other meanes to saue themselves, then by giuing the lie to Saint *Paul*, saying, that that which Saint *Paul* calleth sinne, to speake truly and properly, is no sinne, in men borne againe; that is to say, baptized. It is to no purpose to produce examples, whereby to proue that this word *Sinne* is taken figuratiuely, either for sacrifice, or for occasion of sinne; for to this sinne whereof the Apostle speaketh in the seventh chapter, things are attributed which properly belong vnto sinne, that is, to be condemned in the Law; to do euill; to dwell in man; and to fight and strue against the Law of God which is in the minde.

3 In the third chapter of the same Epistle, verse. 9. and 10. the same Apostle maintaineth, that all, *both Iewes and Gentiles are vnder sinne*, as it is written, *There is none righteous, no not one*. Now the Iewes were circumcised, and many among the Gentiles were baptized.

4 Therefore the same Apostle, Colossians chapter 2. verse 13. saith well, that *God freely pardoneth all our offences*; but saith not, that in this life God maketh vs perfectly tighteous, and without sinne. And Saint Iohn chapter 1. verses 7. 8. of his first Epistle, after he had said, that *The blood of Iesus Christ cleanseth vs from all sinne*; lest that any man thereby should presume that he is without sinne, he addeth, *If we say that we haue not sinne, we deceiue our selves, and truth is not in vs*.

5 The Apostle Saint *Paul* to the Romanes, cha. 6. verse 12. saith,

saith, that *The wages of sinne is death*. Then the death of a man is a certaine prooffe that he is spotted and defiled with sinne. Now diuers little children die after they are baptized before they haue committed any aſuall sinne: then neceſſarily they are spotted with sinne; which sinne conſequently, muſt be originall sinne, ſeeing they haue not yet done any aſuall sinne.

6 In the twelfth verſe of the ſame chapter he ſaith, *Let not ſin therefore reigne in your mortall bodies, that ye ſhould obey it in the luſt; thereto*. Theſe words are a ſilent confeſſion that ſinne dwelleth in vs, and an exhortation to hinder it from hauing the vpper hand, and that dwelling in vs, as it is ſaid in the chapter following, it ſhould not reigne in vs.

7 Experience alſo proueth it. For if fathers and mothers that are baptized haue no originall ſinne, how comes it then that children are borne in originall ſinne? How can fathers and mothers giue that to their children which they haue not?

8 Likewise, do we not ordinarily ſee little children, after they are baptized, to be peruerſe and vncorrigible? They are all naturally inclined to lie. We ſee a peruerſe humour in them: the loue and the reuerence which they beare to their bablers, are euident ſeeds of Idolatry. From whence ſhould this peruerſity enter into them, but onely by their corrupt nature, ſeeing they could not haue learned it by example?

9 Wholoener taketh away a cauſe which can onely produce an effect, taketh away the effect alſo. Now naturall corruption, which is originall ſinne, is the cauſe of all euill actions. Then that being taken away, by conſequence alſo all euill actions are taken away. But ſeeing that after baptiſme euill actions appeare, it is certaine that originall ſinne is not aboliſhed.

10 If a man that is baptized becometh prophane and impious, hath he not originall ſinne? hath he not that corruption and inclination to euill that he brought into the world? If he hath it, how is it come againe after he loſt it in Baptiſme? If he hath it not, how is he ſo much inclined to euill?

11 I leaue a great number of places in the holy Scriptures which condemne all men, euen the most righteous, to be sinners, and summon the most perfect that are in the church of Rome to the testimony of their owne consciences. For who is he among them that is not oftentimes moued with pride and choler, and infected with euill desires? What is he that loueth his God with all his heart, and his neighbour as himselfe? What is he among them that doth not sometimes lie, seeing that the Scripture which lieth not, saith that all men are liars? Psal. 116. After they have disputed against vs, each of them is feuerally to dispute against himselfe, and to gain say the testimony of his owne conscience.

12 Do not they themselves, with the Councell of Trent, confesse that concupiscence remaineth after baptism? This concupiscence is sinne; for that *S. Paul* to the Romanes chap. 7. verse 7. calleth it sinne, hauing learned that of the law, which saith, *Thou shalt not couet*. For Saint Iohn in his first Epistle, third chapter, and fourth verse saith, *Sinne is the transgression of the Law*. To thinke to deceiue or mocke the commandement of God, and such expresse words of the Apostle, by a distinction forged in Schooles, is to leane nothing certaine in the word of God. Our Aduersaries say that concupiscence is sinne when it hath a resolute desire or will to offend God, but if it be but motions without resolution, and without determination, that it is no sinne. Remembring not that when they say so, they contradict themselves, and iniure Saint Paul the Apostle. For our Aduersaries confesse, that Saint Paul acknowledged, that this concupiscence which he calleth Sin, remained in him. Now would they say, that Saint Paul had a determinate will to sinne, or that he tooke pleasure to offend God?

That concupiscence it selfe, without a stayed resolution to sinne, is sinne.

13 Moreover that God commanding vs to loue and serue him with all our hearts, by consequence forbiddeth the investigations and motions of euill desires, which can haue no being when the heart is wholly possessed with the Spirit of God. Whereupon also Iesus Christ nor the blessed Saints in heauen haue not those concupiscences.

14 Reason also is therein most manifest, for he is put to death that hath neuer so little conferred with the enemy to betray a cowne, although he hath not proceeded to a resolute will to execute that treason. And a maide that giueth eare vnto vnchast temptations, maketh a breach in her credit, although she hath not proceeded to a full resolution to do euill. Yet these men asseure, that concupiscence which tempteth and solliciteth man to offend God, is not sinne, so that the will consent not thereunto, and that men proceed not to a full resolution. If the will did holily to resist concupiscence, concupiscence did wickedly to tempt and sollicit the will.

15 Behold the Apostle, who (by our aduersaries confession) speaking of this concupiscence, saith, that by it he doth the euill that he would not, Rom. 7. 19. and that it fighteth against the law of his mind, verse 23. that is, against the law of God printed in his minde. How then dare they say, that to do euill is no sinne? and that to resist against the Law of God and to strue against it, is no offence to God?

16 If concupiscence without resolute will is no sinne after baptism, much lesse then is it sinne in children before baptism, when man is wholly without a small vse of his will.

17 To this euill the question is to find a remedie: which remedie ought not to be forged in our owne braines, but to be found in the word of God, wherein we find these two remedies. The one, that all our sinnes are pardoned by Iesus Christ, and by consequence originall sinne. The other, that God regenerateth vs by his holy Spirit, to cause sinne to reigne no more in vs, touching our hearts with repentance. Of these two benefits baptism is a Sacrament. Thus *Iohn baptized the baptisme of repentance for remission of sinnes*, Marke. 1. 4. but that originall sinne should be abolished by baptism, the word of God saith not so. It is an opinion contradicted by the word of God, and by experience.

18 Hereby *M. Arnon* allegation is refuted, which imposeth vpon vs, that we say, that Iesus Christ by his death applied by baptism, could not draw vs from the death of sinne, and leaueth vs buried in the corruption of the old man, and doth

Coloss. 2. 13.

Acts 10. 43.

1. Ioh. 1. 7.

doth not truly regenerate vs: which is to make vs say the contrary vnto that which we beleewe. By the full remission of sins applyed in baptisme, God draweth vs from death; and by the Spirit of regeneration he beginneth life in vs: which is not perfected all at once, but goeth forward by degrees; which doth not hinder vs from being acceptable vnto God, nor that he should not acknowledge vs for his adopted and redeemed children in Iesus Christ.

19 S. Augustine is very resolute in this matter, in the booke of Mariage and of Concupiscence, Chap. 25. and 26.^a Concupiscence, saith he, is pardoned in baptisme, not to the end that it should be no more, but because it should not be imputed for sinne. A great part of the booke against Iulian is written to prove that Concupiscencia remittitur in reatu, & manet in actu: that concupiscence touching the guiltinesse in man is remitted, and yet remaineth touching the act or actually. He often repeateth that this originall corruption is remitted in baptisme, and that *Lex peccati remissa est in regeneratione spirituali, & manet in carne mortali*: The law of sin is pardoned in spiritual regeneration, but remaineth in mortall flesh. And in the fift booke against Iulian, Chap. 3.^b Concupiscence of the flesh, (against the which the good spirit fighteth) is sinne, because it is disobedience against the law of the mind: and a paine for sinne, because it is returned backe againe for the merits of the disobedient; and a cause of sinne, by the fault of the consentor, or by the contagion of originall sinne. And in the 41. Treatise vpon Saint Iohn: *The Apostle saith not that there is no more sinne. As long as thou livest, it is necessarie that sinne should be in thy members, but let vs strue to keepe it from reigning in vs.* In all these places this holy man acknowledgeth, that after baptisme, still concupiscence is sinne, seeing we haue need that God should pardon it, and that after baptisme sinne remaineth yet in vs.

Thomas the^a father of scholers, vpon the fourth Chapter of the Epistle to the Romans, in his fiftle lesson is resolute there-

num auferatur. ^a Peccatum originale remitti dicitur quia transit reatus superueniente gratia, sed remanet actu, remanente fomiti sine concupiscencia.

^a Dimitti concupiscenciam carnis in baptismo, non ut non sit, sed ut in peccatum non imputetur.

^b Concupiscencia carnis, aduersus quam bonum concupiscit spiritus & peccatum est, quia illi inest inobedientia contra dominatum mentis, & pena peccati est, quia reddita est meritis inobedientis & causa peccati &c.

^c Non aut, non sit, sed non regnet. Quamdiu vivis, peccatum necesse est esse in membris. Saltem illi reg-

in, saying, *It is said that originall sinne is remitted, because the obligation of the paine is abolished, grace helping, but it remaineth in effect.*

ARNOUX.

30. Self.

Places quoted in the margin of the Confession Rom. 7. 7. What shall we say then: is the Law sinne? God forbid, nay I knew not sinne but by the Law: for I had not knowne lust, except the Law had said, thou shalt not lust.

I am abashed, that they recite this place, wherein neither baptism, condemnation, imputation, nor any distinction between pœna & culpa is once spoken of. And yet they quote but this one text only: whereby the Apostle plainly sheweth the weakenesse of the Law, which sheweth sinne and cannot beate it, and the point of our rebellion, which is augmented by the onely opposition of the Law: to the end that by these two points we might comprehend the necessitie of grace, which bridling concupiscence, giveth the Law the upper hand, and maketh vs obedient vnto it.

MOVLIN.

M. Arnoux
falsification.

This place thus confounded hath need of an interpreter. We haue already aduertised M. Arnoux that there is a fault in the cypher of the place quoted, and that the seuenth verse is set for the seuenteenth verse, where S. Paul acknowledgeth, that sinne dwelleth in him. Now Saint Paul was baptized. Then this is an expresse example of a man that was baptized, in whom neuertheless sinne dwelt. Is there any thing clearer or more certaine then this prooffe, against the which, in stead of touching it, M. Arnoux lifts vp his spirit, and takes a wrong flight, in affected words farre from the question.

ARNOUX.

31. Self.

Contrarie text; 1. Cor. 6. 11. Such were some of you: bene meneth fornicators, Idolaters, adulterers, wantons, filthy, sheemes, cometous, drunkards, raylers, extortioners, and in a word, full of sinne: but you haue bene washed, but you haue bene sanctified, but you haue bene iustificed. Could he more formally declare the effect

effect of baptisme, and the annihilating of sinne?

MOVLIN.

This place is chopt, which is a kind of falsification. *M. Arnoux* alledgeth this place to proue that those that are baptized haue no more originall sinne, and that it is abolished by baptisme; and therefore he clipt off and suppressed the last line of this verse, by the which it might be knowne, that in it Saint Paul spake not of baptisme: *You haue bene* (saith the Apostle) *washed, you haue bene sanctified, you haue bene iustified in the name of Iesus Christ, and by the Spirit of our God.* He attributeth these effects of saluation to the vertue of Iesus Christ, and to the efficacie of his Spirit, which we ought not to re-straine to baptisme, whereof in all that Chapter there is no mention made.

M. Arnoux falsification.

ARNOUX.

And Rom. 6. 11. and in all places: Likewise thinke you also that you are dead to sinne, but are alive to God in Iesus Christ our Lord. And a litle before, verse 2: How shall we that are dead to sin liue yet therein? For if we be ingrafted with him to the similitude of his death by baptisme, whereof he cometh to speake, euen so shall we be to the similitude of his resurrection. Knowing this, that our old man is crucified with him, that the body of sinne might be destroyed, (Note destroyed) that henceforth we should not serue sin, for he that is dead is freed from sinne. 32. Sect.

MOVLIN.

These places setue to fill vp roome, and would be as well elswhere. Where haue you one word therein touching that which he would vrge? that is, that those that are baptized haue no originall sinne? How absurd should I be, if I should argue in this manner: We are baptized to the end that we should attaine to eternall life: then we obtaine eternall life as soone as we are baptized? And yet this is *M. Arnoux* discourse, who produceth the graces which we receiue of Iesus Christ, to perswade vs that we receiue the perfections of

H 2

these

these graces at our baptisme: although we be baptized to the end to destroy sinne, it followeth not, that the entire destruction is perfected in baptisme; which is one of the meanes to attaine to perfection.

THE TWELFTH ARTICLE.

We beleue that God withdraweth from this corruption and generall condemnation whereinto all men are plunged, all those whom in his eternall and vnmoueable counsell he hath chosen of his onely goodnesse and mercie in Iesus Christ our Lord, without consideration of their works, leauing the rest in the same corruption and condemnation; in them to shew his iustice, as in the first he maketh the riches of his mercie to shine: for one is not better then another, vntill it pleaseth God to discerne them according to his vnmoueable counsell, which he hath determined in Iesus Christ before the beginning of the world: and no man also may thrust himselfe into such a good by his owne vertue, seeing that by nature we cannot haue one onely good motion, affection, nor thought, vntill God hath preuented vs, and hath disposed vs thereunto.

THE THIRTEENTH ARTICLE.

We beleue that in the same Iesus Christ, all that which was required to saluation, hath bene offered and communicated vnto vs: who being giuen vs for saluation, hath thereby bene made vnto vs, wisdome, righteousness,

reousnesse, sanctification, and redemption; in such manner, that declining from him, we renounce the mercy of God, whereunto we ought to haue our onely refuge.

THE FOVRTEENTH ARTICLE.

We belecue that Iesus Christ, being the wisdom of God, and his eternall Sonne, tooke our flesh vpon him, to be God and man in one person, yea man like vnto vs, suffering in body and soule, onely that he was pure and without sin. And touching his humanitie, that he was the true seed of *Abraham* and of *Dauid*, although he was conceived by the secret vertue of the holy Spirit. Wherein we detest all the heresies which anciently haue troubled the Church, and specially the diabolicall imaginations of *Seruetus*; who attribureth to Iesus Christ a fantastick diuinitie, saying, that he is the *Idea* and patterne of all things, and nameth him the personall, or figuratiue Sonne of God; and finally forgeth him a body of threee vncreated elements, and so mixeth and destroyeth both the two natures.

THE FIFTEENTH ARTICLE.

We belecue, that in one selfe same person, that is, Iesus Christ, the two natures are truly and vnseparably ioyned and vnited, each of the natures neuerthelesse remaining in their distinct proprietie: In

such sort, that as in this coniunction the diuine nature retaining his propertie, continued vncreated, infinite, and filling all things, so the humane nature continued finite, hauing his forme, measure, and proprietic. And also, although Iesus Christ when he rose againe, gaue immortalitie to his body, yet he tooke not from it the truth of his nature. And so we consider him in such sort in his diuinitie, that we bereaue him not of his humanitie.

THE SIXTEENTH ARTICLE.

We belecue that God sending his Sonne, shewed his loue and inestimable goodnesse towards vs, by deliuering him to death, and raising him againe, to fulfill all righteousnesse, and to obtaine eternall life for vs.

THE SEVENTEENTH ARTICLE.

*Where M. Arnoux moueth the question touching
the imputation of the righteousnesse
of Iesus Christ.*

We beleue, that by the onely sacrifice which Iesus Christ offered vpon the crosse, we are reconciled to God, to be holden and reputed iust before him; because we could not be pleasing vnto God, nor be participants of his adoption, vnlesse he forgauē our sinnes and butied them. So we professe that Iesus Christ is our entire and perfect washing: and that in his death we haue entire satisfaction, to acquit vs of our sinnes and

and iniquities, whereof we are guiltie, and cannot be deliuered but by this meanes.

ARNOUX.

That is as much to say, as that the Sonne of God doth not truly make vs iust, nor worthy to be beloued of his Father, but leaning vs in the filthinesse of sinne, he answereth for vs, to the end that his Father should not execute his vengeance vpon vs: and in a word, it maketh vs to be accounted good and righteous, or rather used so, alibough in effect we are vniust, wicked, and full of sinne. Whereby it followeth, that not onely God deceineth himselfe, reputing them to be iust that are not, but may be by his grace: which is not so feeble and weake, but that it can make them iust: seeing that the Apostle, Rom. 5. 20. saith, Where sinne abounded, there grace abounded much more.

That the righteousness of Christ is imputed vnto vs.

MOVLIN.

To know the truth of our beleefe, we need but take the contrary to that which *M. Arnoux* attributeth vnto vs: for he is sworne neuer to report the truth of our beleefe.

Then to set downe the truth of our doctrine, and the point of the difference: we say that by the obedience which Iesus Christ yeilded to his Father, we are made righteous, and that the righteousness of Iesus Christ is ours, because it is imputed and allowed vnto those that beleeuie in Iesus Christ. On the contrary, the Church of Rome saith, that man is iustified by his owne workes. *Bellarmino* in the first booke of Iustification, cap. 2. saith, that the forme of iustification is charitie. And in truth this word, *iustification*, among our aduersaries is taken for regeneration or sanctification, and for the studie of good workes. And therefore the Councell of Trent in the sixt Session, setteth downe diuers increasings and degrees of Iustification.

In this matter we agree with our aduersaries in two things:

The first, that good workes are necessary to saluation, and that God acknowledgeth not those men to be iust, that continue and take pleasure in doing euill. The second is, that the question is not touching that iustice whereby we are iustified before men, but of that whereby God acknowledgeth vs to be iust, and by the vertue whereof we may stand before him at the day of Iudgement.

The word of God teacheth vs, that this righteousness which iustifieth vs before God, is the righteousness of Iesus Christ, whereby he hath satisfied for vs, yeelding himselfe culpable, to the end that we might be absolued; lading himselfe with our sinnes, to the end that his righteousness and obedience might be imputed, allowed, and reckoned vnto vs.

The Apostle Saint Paul, 2. Cor. 5. 21. saith, *God hath made him to be sinne for vs which knew no sinne, that we should be made the righteousness of God through him.* And Romans 5. 19. *By the obedience of one man, many are made righteous:* And in the 18. verse he teacheth, that the righteousness of Iesus Christ iustifieth vs, saying, that *The iustifying of one doth iustifie vs.* If by iustifying, we must here vnderstand sanctifying, or regenerating, the Apostle would haue attributed this iustification to the Spirit of God, and not to the obedience of Iesus Christ; which iustifieth vs, because that by it we are absolued, and acknowledged to be righteous before God, as if we our selues had accomplished this righteousness. For seeing that our Adversaries confesse, that our sinnes haue bene imputed to Iesus Christ, why do they find it strange that the righteousness of Iesus Christ should be imputed vnto vs, seeing our sinnes were imputed vnto Iesus Christ to no other end, but that his righteousness should be imputed vnto vs? * So they acknowledge, that the sinne of the first Adam is imputed to vs, and yet find fault that the righteousness of the second Adam should be imputed vnto vs: notwithstanding that the second Adam, which is Iesus Christ, came to no other end, but to remedie the euill that entred by the first Adam, bringing thereunto a contrary remedie.

And which is more, the Church of Rome by the doctrine of superabundant

* Bellarm. de
amiss. gratia
& statu pec-
catis l. 5. c. 17.
Peccatum A-
dami nobis co-
municatur per
generationem,
eo modo quo
communicari
potest id quod
transit. nimi-
rum per im-
putationem, om-
nibus enim
imputatur qui
in Adam nati-
suntur.

superabundant satisfactions, gathered in the treasure of the Church, whereof the Pope hath the keyes; will haue the fastings, stripes, and paines of the Saints, to be imputed and reckoned vnto those that buy or get pardons; and in the meane time they chafe and storme when we say, that the obedience and the sufferings of Iesus Christ are imputed vnto vs.

The same Apostle, Rom. 4. 6. saith, that *God imputeth righteousness without works*: speaking of *Abraham* already regenerated, to whom he saith that faith was imputed for righteousness. Then *Abraham* was iustified, not by the workes of regeneration, but by another righteousness which is imputed vnto him. Now what this righteousness is, he himselfe declares afterward in the eighteenth and nineteenth verses of the Chapter following, where he speaketh of *one only iustifying iustice*, and saith, that *By the obedience of one, many shall be made righteous*. Where he speaketh of the obedience of Iesus Christ.

The same Apostle in Rom. 4. 5. saith, that *Faith is counted for righteousness*. Whereupon I aske, which of these two (to speake properly) is imputed vnto vs for righteousness, whether faith in Iesus Christ, inasmuch as it is inherent in vs, or the righteousness of Iesus Christ apprehended by faith. It is certaine that faith, forasmuch as it is a vertue inherent in vs, cannot be imputed vnto vs; for our vertues and our actions are not imputed vnto vs, but another mans, when they are allowed and reckoned vnto vs, as if we had done them. As also, that to beleue, of its owne nature is not a righteousness: much lesse to beleue according to the faith of the Romish Church, which is, but to beleue that all that which God hath said, is true; which is a beleefe that the diuels haue, and more certainly then men. It resteth then, that faith is imputed vnto vs for righteousness, because it apprehendeth and layeth hold vpon the righteousness and the benefit of Iesus Christ, by the which we are iustified, that is, absolved and quit before the iudgement seate of God. And so faith iustificieth, in the same manner that the mouth seedeth man, because it taketh and receiue

other thing, and this simply is our beleefe. And in the tenth Chapter, after he hath said that Christ is our righteousness, because he hath satisfied for vs, he addeth; *In this manner it should not be an absurditie if any man should say, that the righteousness and the merites of Christ are imputed vnto vs, because they are giuen and applyed vnto vs, as if we our selues had satisfied vnto God.* Then let vs hold there; for we say nothing more. By this meanes God shall not be deceiued, as *M. Arnoux* saith; and our righteousness shall be much more assured then if it were grounded vpon our owne workes: and yet God will not leaue to regenerate and sanctifie vs inwardly, and frame vs to good workes. As God was not deceiued when he imputed our sinnes to Iesus Christ, so he is not deceiued when he imputeth the righteousness of Iesus Christ vnto vs. There is neither iniustice nor ignorance committed, to deliuer a prisoner that lieth in prison for debt, when another man hath payed it for him. For, as the sinne of *Adam* was imputed to his posteritie, because he represented all humane kind, as the beginning of them; so the righteousness of Iesus Christ is imputed to all the faithfull, because that by accomplishing all righteousness, he represented all the Church, as the beginning thereof. And the righteousness of Iesus Christ is imputed vnto the faithfull by greater reason then the sinne of *Adam* is imputed vnto other men; because *Adam* did not vnder- take for others to obey God, but Iesus Christ voluntarily Galat. 3.13. subiected himselfe to the Law, to deliuer vs from the curse of and cap.4.4.5 the Law.

ARNOUX.

Places quoted in the margin of the Confession: 1. Pet. 2. 24. 34. Sect. Who his owne selfe bare our sinnes in his body on the tree, that we being dead to sinne, should liue in righteousness: by whose stripes ye were healed; and in the verses following. For ye were as sheepe going astray, but are now returned vnto the Shepherd and Bishop of your soules.

These places are so farre from confirming that for the which they are alledged, that they rather overthrow it: seeing the A-
postle

posse saith, That we are by Iesus Christs means, dead to sinne, healed of sin, conuerted from sinne. Could he cleaerlier say, that sin liueth no more in vs, that the mortall disease thereof is no more in vs, and that we no more go astray? And can a man from thence conclude the contrary, that we are holden and reputed to be righteous, although in effect we are not?

MOVLIN.

This place of Saint Peter is not employed in our Confession to that sence or to that end which this Doctor imagineth. Our Confession saith, that by the onely sacrifice which Iesus Christ offered vpon the crosse, we are reconciled to God. For prooffe thereof, the first Epistle and the second Chapter and twentie fourth verse of Saint Peter is quoted in the margenty Christ bare our finnes in his body on the tree, that we being dead to sinne, should liue in righteousness: by whose stripes ye were healed. Can there be a stronger, or a more expresse place alledged, to proue that Iesus Christ by his death vpon the crosse hath reconciled vs vnto God? for that is the bearing of our finnes in his body on the tree, and to heale vs. But it pleaseth *M. Arnoux* to make this place serue to another end, contrary to our meaning.

And yet this place proues not that we are already wholly dead to sinne, nor that we are exempted from sinne. *S. Peter* speaketh of the benefitis which the death of Iesus Christ bringeth vnto vs; but of these benefitis there are some whereunto we cannot attaine but by degrees, and whereof the perfect accomplishment shall not be performed but in the kingdome of heauen. But *M. Arnoux* will perswade vs, that he is absolutely righteous, and that sinne liueth no more in him: and yet neuerthelesse, he goes to the Iubilie to get pardons, and when he is confessed, he receiueth absolution: when he saith his *Pater noster*, he saith, *Forgiue vs our trespasses*; he beleaueth to go to Purgatorie, and makes profession to doubt of his saluation. And if with the rest of the Iesuites, he approppeth and alloweth of Equiuocations in matter or trials of Iustice; of the rebellion of subiects against their King, and
of

of the secret of Confession, by the which a Priest shall haue knowledge of an enterprise against the life of a King: I can not see how that agreeth with a perfect righteousness.

ARNOUX.

Contrary places. Rom. 5. 5. The loue of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the holy Ghost, which is given vnto vs. Weigh these words (Shed abroad in our hearts.) Then it is not imputed without other effect. 35. Sect.

MOVLIN.

To whom speakes he? The Apostle saith, and we also with him, that the loue wherewith God loueth vs, is shed abroad in our hearts by the holy Ghost. What is that to the purpose touching the righteousness of Iesus Christ, and of his imputation? And againe, did we euer say, that this imputation is without any other effect?

ARNOUX.

Eph. 4. 23. 24. And be renewed in the spirit of your mind, and put on the new man, which after God is created vnto righteousness and true holiness. 36. Sect.

It is an error to beleene, that by the new man he understandeth Iesus Christ, seeing that Iesus Christ was neuer the old man, and that Saint Paul alwayes attributeth to one and the same subject, to be the old man, or the man of sinne, and the new man, or renewed by the grace of Iesus Christ; as old, he is a member of the first Adam; as new, of the second: he descendeth from the first by naturall generation, which transferreth sinne vnto him; and descendeth from the second by the second birth, which maketh him a child of God by the fountains of grace.

MOVLIN.

This in no sort toucheth or concerneth the imputation of the righteousness of Christ. I thinke M. Arnoux thought vpon some other thing, or that some other body hath thrust this allegation into his booke without his knowledge. What makes

makes this to our question, whether Iesus Christ is called or not called the new man?

ARNOVX.

37. Sect.

Addē Romans 5. 19. For as by one mans disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of One, many also shall be made righteous.

And then as it is thus that we are sinners by Adam, and not ouely reputed so; euen so are we righteous by Iesus Christ, and not ouely accounted so.

MOVLIN.

All that is true: for by Iesus Christ the children of God are truly made righteous in two sorts: first, because they are truly absolved and iustified before the iudgement seate of God. Secondly, because the Spirit of Iesus Christ working in them, truly regenerate them. But this regeneration is done by degrees, it beginneth here on earth, and is perfected in heauen.

ARNOVX.

38. Sect.

The same article lower. We professe that Iesus Christ is our entire and perfect cleansing or washing, and that in his death we haue entire satisfaction, to discharge vs of our offences and iniquities whereof we are culpable.

These faire words are set downe to abolish all fit or proper satisfaction, to draw the spirit of penitencie out of a mans heart, to quench the desire to endure or suffer any thing for the loue of God whom we haue offended, to drowne the soule in the bog of negligence and carelesnesse of good workes: and to be short, to assure the wickedest man that is, of the righteousness of the Sonne of God, and of escaping the rigour of his Father in his person, without binding the sinner to punish his sinnes in himselfe with a good will.

Of humane Satisfaction.

MOVLIN.

Our Confession saith, that Iesus Christ is the ouely purgation
of

of our finnes, and that his death is a full and perfect satisfaction for the same: which we ground vpon the word of God, which saith, Apocalips 1. 5. That *Iesus Christ hath washed vs from our finnes in his owne blood.* 1. Ioh. 1. 7. *The blood of Iesus Christ cleanseth vs from all sinne.* Colof. 2. 13. *By him God freely forgiveth all our trespasses.* Acts 4. 12. *There is no other name vnder heauen whereby we must be saved.* Colof. 1. 19. 20. *For it pleased the Father, that in him should all fulnesse dwell, and having made peace through the blood of the crosse by him to reconcile all things vnto himselfe, both which are in earth, and which are in heauen.* 1. Ioh. 2. 2. *He is the reconciliation for our finnes, and not for ours onely, but also for the finnes of the whole world.* Heb. 10. 14. *For by one offering he hath consecrated for ever them that are sanctified.* Heb. 7. 25. *He is able also perfectly to save them that come vnto God by him.* Rom. 3. 24. *We are iustified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Iesus Christ.* And to conclude, it is the whole scope of the Gospel.

This so holy, so euident, and so true a doctrine, full of consolation, displeaseth *M. Arnonx*: he saith it abolissheth our satisfactions, quencheth the spirit of penitence, and drowneth our soules in the gulph of presumption.

Touching mens satisfactions, we say briefly, that if the word Satisfaction were taken in that sence which the ancient Fathers tooke it, that is, for humiliation and acknowledgment of our faults, there should be no disputation betweene vs. But at this day, satisfaction signifieth a payment of debts, and a recompence which man maketh to God to satisfie his iustice. The Catechisme of the Councell of Trent, saith, that Satisfaction is an entire payment of that thing which is due, and a recompence which man maketh vnto God for his finnes: as when a man punisheth himselfe (as *M. Arnonx* saith) by fasting, whipping, pilgrimages, and giuing something to the Church, and when God torments him in Purgatory. Cardinall Bellarmines words are remarkeable vpon this point, in the first booke of Indulgences, Chap. 4. *If a righteous man (saith he) by his workes may by equiuallence merite life everlasting, why can he not satisfie for temporall paine, which is*



*Cap. de Satisfac-
tione peni-
tentia. Satisfac-
tio est res
debita integra
solutio: Est
compensatio
cum homo pro
peccatis com-
missis Deo ali-
quid persolvat*

a lesse thing? And in the second Chapter of the same booke he saith, *The remission of the paine is due to the satisfying worke, by commutative iustice:* which is a iustice that payeth so much for so much, or a bartering iustice, in such manner that God ought to be content therewith. By this reckoning, God should do contrary to iustice, if he should not accept for good payment, the satisfying paines wherewith a sinner punisheth himselfe. And in the 10. Chap. of the first booke of Purgatorie; *It seemeth* (saith he) *more probable, that in effect there is but one satisfaction, which is ours.* Touching that of Iesus Christ, he will haue it to serue onely to make ours auailable. Nay the pride of the Romane Church is so great, that in it they hold that a man can make more satisfaction vnto God then he ought to do, so that there is something remaining to be allowed to the sinner ouer and aboue: that is it which they call superabundant satisfaction, which is the monasticall life.

1 As for vs, seeing that in Iesus Christ we haue a full satisfaction for all our finnes, we are content therewith, and take not vpon vs by our owne sufferings to pay a debt which Iesus Christ hath wholly satisfied.

2 Also we do not belecue that Iesus Christ died to make our sufferings of any worth before God, but to free and exempt vs from suffering. For the benefit of Iesus Christs suffering consisteth not herein, to make vs pay, but to pay and satisfie for vs vnto God. Saint Paul in the 1. to Tim. 2.6. saith, that *Iesus Christ gaue himselfe a ranfome for vs.* But he saith not, that he gaue vs the vertue to pay our owne ranfome. And the Apostle, Heb. 1.4. saith, that *The Sonne of God hath by himselfe purged our finnes.* Then not by our satisfactions.

3 That if it be an honour which God doth vnto vs, by our sufferings to make our owne satisfaction; (as the Papists alledge) & that if our satisfying paines and punishments are reckoned among the graces of God, the diuells and the damned shall haue more part in those graces then we; seeing God doth them that honour, to make them to pay by continuall tormentes, and draweth full satisfaction from them.

4 God forbid that we should belecue, that God takes pay-

payment twise for one debt, when the first payment is sufficient. Will God that is soueraignly iust, after he hath pardoned all our offences, punish those sinnes that he hath pardoned with satisfying paines?

5 And seeing that the Church of Rome beleueth, that by the death of Iesus Christ all our guiltinesse is taken away, will God punish men without fault in a burning fire? The cause which onely produceth an effect being taken away, by necessitie the effect ceaseth. Now the fault is the cause which onely produceth the satisfying punishment. Therefore the fault being taken away, necessarily satisfying punishment is taken away: as *Tertullian* saith in his booke of Baptisme cap. 5. *The fault being taken away, the paine also is taken away.*

Exempto reatu remittitur & pena.

6 Besides, God is no mocker: but he should manifestly mocke vs, if he should say, I will forgive thee, but yet I will punish thee. I forgive thee thy debt, but thou shalt pay me. For our sinnes are debts, the payment whereof is the punishment.

7 It is not credible that God would haue vs to be more mercifull then himselfe. But he will haue vs wholly to forgive him that hath offended vs: he permitteth not vs to take any vengeance or reuenge after we haue forgien him. For what is forgienesse but not to punish? Then if God forgieueth the sinne, and not the punishment of the sinne, the way is made open to fraudulent reconciliations: and he that shall haue pardoned an iniury will in his heart reserue a punishment for the same. For he will say: Will you haue me more mercifull then God? herein I haue followed his example. We are too much inclined to vice, without seeking to proue that God encites vs thereunto by his example.

8 I would haue them to shew me, how and in what manner Iesus Christ bore our offences: was it not by suffering the punishment due to them? And if he endured the punishment, was it not to exempt vs from it? This is it which *S. Augustine* saith in his 27. Sermon of the words of the Lord. *Christ taking upon him the punishment and not the fault, hath abolished both*

Susciendo penam, & non susciendo culpam, & culpam delens & penam.

the fault and the punishment.

9 It appeareth also how foolish this doctrine is, that the fault should be remitted and not the punishment, by this, that there is no criminall person but would be very well content that the king should not pardon his offence, so that he would wholly remit the paine and punishment thereof, and not suffer him to endure any punishment at all.

10 If by our owne suffering we must satisfie and appease the wrath of God, when shall we haue satisfied for the least part of our sinnes? seeing that by the iudgement of the Sonne of God, Mat. 5. 12, to call our brother foole is a fault punishable with hell fire: and that S. Paul 1. Cor. 6. saith, that *euill speakers shall not inherite the kingdome of God.* And yet these are sinnes from which the most righteous men can hardly cleare themselves.

11 Adde hereunto, that by this doctrine the afflictions of the faithfull are bitter, and their finger is dipt in gall. For the faithfull which beleueeth that God punisheth him for his good, and that it is a great punishment not to be chastised, is easily comforted in his afflictions, the which he receiueeth as spirituall remedies. The maladies of the body are vnto him medicines of the soule. Pouertie to him is a diet, and a discipline of abstinence. Banishment an abandoning of the world, and an admonition that he is a stranger vpon earth. And if they be afflictions for the Gospel, he glorieth therein, as in honorable wounds and badges of our warfare, and conformities to the crosse of Christ. But where shall the faithfull find comfort and consolation in their evils, if they must beleue that God punisheth them to satisfie his iustice? and that their sufferings are satisfactions vnto him? Therein they haue no other consolation then Pagans haue, which is, to giue place to necessitie, and to arme themselves with hardnesse against blowes, with a kind of patience without comfort.

12 Then when these satisfactions shall be well weighed, they will be found very light: and it will appeare, that the Papists would pay the iustice of God with base money; whose satisfactions are, to abstaine from flesh certaine dayes, to

go on pilgrimage, and so to leade an idle life; to gird their bodies with cords, to enter into the Order of any Friars, to whip themselves openly, as the penitents in Rome vse to do in the weeke before Easter, some for their owne sinnes, others being hired, whipping themselves for other mens sinnes: some also for loue, and to satisfie God for the sinnes of their mistresses. Thus you see wherewith they would haue God satisfied and contented for their sinnes, for they esteeme it to be an easie composition. To ioine these things with the infinite satisfactions of the Sonne of God, is as if one should sew beggers rags to a kings robe.

13 Certainly these people with their penall workes, whippings, and voluntarie torments, seeme to me to speake vnto God, and to say, I will satisfie thee. Thou wilt wholly remit my sinne, but I will not be so much beholden vnto thee. It is great reason then that they should pay to the full. And if thereupon by a fantastickall penitence, or by a proud humilitie they cut and mangle their flesh, I trow they haue well deserved it. And seeing that to satisfie God they are obstinately bent to be burnt after this life in so long and burning a fier, it is reason that they should soake in fier, and that the sentence of Christ which they alledge vnto vs, should be practised vpon themselves, Math. 5. 26. *Verily I say vnto thee, thou shalt not come out thence, till thou hast payed the uttermost farthing.*

14 But at the day of iudgement, when they must yeeld an account of their actions, and that their sinnes shall be layed open before them, what shall be their excuse? They will say, *Lord it is true, I haue committed such and such sinnes, but I haue satisfied for them; for I haue whipt my selfe, I haue abstained from eating of flesh for so many dayes, I went on pilgrimage, I was one of the order of Gray friars.* But here I am afraid, that things being put into the ballance of Gods Iustice, they will be found too light by many gaines, and that the same which they giue for satisfaction, would rather be found to be a sinne; seeing they are things which God neuer required at their hands. I am afraid that these satisfiers will be found culpable, not onely for seeking to pay God with false money, but

Math. 17. 5.

1. Ioh. 1. 7.

also finding out another satisfaction then that of the Sonne in whom the Father is well pleased, and whose blood cleanseth vs from all our finnes.

15 But among the satisfying paines, there is one kind that to me seemes to be full of impietie. The Church of Rome placeth prayers and almes among penall works and satisfying paines. What a religion is this, that placeth good workes among sufferings for finnes? which on the contrarie, if they should be prohibited to a man fearing God, it would be an vn-sufferable punishment vnto him. They intend then that men must serue God by punishment. By this meanes good workes are made odious, and the exercise of pietie becomes a punishment. Neuerthelesse they haue some reason to put prayers (such as they make) among penances; for, to be condemned to repeate one prayer fittie times one after the other, in an vnknowne language, and euery day to say his seuen Psalmes of mercy, without vnderstanding them, byting their fingers because of the tediousnesse thereof, me thinkes it is a great punishment.

16 Superstitious ignorance hauing sowne the seeds of this abuse, the avarice & ambition of Priests hath nourished them: for there is nothing but they will do it for gaine. Who being very sensible in the belly, are much moued when men touch their profits, and seeke to shorten their commons. For these satisfactions are very fruitfull vnto them, seeing that Purgatory is so beneficiall vnto them, and that by the satisfactions which Priests impose vpon men, they take authority to inflict corporall punishments vpon sinners, which by the order of the Romane Church may be changed into pecuniarie punishments. And that by the same meanes, the Popes haue bene so bold to punish kings, and make them to endure blowes with a whip; as *Alexander* the third did to *Henry* the second King of England; and as *Clément* the eighth did to our great King *Henry* the fourth in the person of the Bishop of Eureux his embassadour; to whom falling downe at his feete the Pope caused certaine blowes with a whip to be giuen for a satisfaction. Pope *Innocent* the third imposed vpon *John* King

of

a I

of

of England for satisfaction, that he should resigne his kingdom vnto him, and make his Crowne and Realme tributary to the Pope.

17. Iesus Christ did not so, for in the eight of Saint Iohn, hauing pardoned the woman taken in adulteric, he imposed no satisfying paine vnto her, but onely said vnto her, *Go and sinne no more.* The Apostle Saint Paul in 2. Cor. 2. saith, that he had pardoned the incestuous person, to whom neuertheless he enioyned no penance after the pardon.

18. If these satisfactions be euill, why do they enioyne them? If they be good, why do they dispencc with them by Indulgences? why do they hinder the sinner from making satisfaction vnto God?

The abuse being thus discovered, they runne for aide, and seeke to support their ruinous cause with reeds.

1. They alledge the counsell that Daniell, 4. 27. gaue to *Nebuchadnezzar, Redeeme thy sinnes by right conscience, and thine iniquities by shewing mercy to the poore.* But they are deceiued to thinke that Daniell speaketh of redeeming in respect of God: for he speaketh of redeeming & satisfying before men, whom the king had wronged, whom he ought to recompence by liberalitie. Adde hereunto that almes are good workes, and not punishments nor penances. And which is more, our aduersaries will haue almes and other satisfactions not to satisfie for sinnes, but for the punishments due to sinnes. The chiefe point is, that the Church of Rome holdeth that satisfactions serue onely to satisfie for the temporall punishment, and not for the eternall: and that they serue for nothing before baptism, no more then they did in time past before circumcision. Now this king was a pagan vncircumcized, and ought rather to thinke vpon sauing himselfe from eternall paines: for the satisfactions of Purgatorie are of no value nor worth vnto them that go into hell: and to go about to satisfie for temporall punishment, when a man is bound to eternall punishment, is all one as to set vp a weathercocke before the foundation be layed.

Also they say, that the benefit of Iesus Christ ought to be

Reasons
wherewith
our aduersa-
ries vse to
support their
satisfactions,

applied vnto vs, and that it is applied vnto vs by satisfactorie punishment, and by the torments of Purgatorie. Whereunto I answer, that they say this without prooffe, and without testimony of the holy Scriptures. It belongs to the word of God to prescribe vs the meanes to applie vnto our selues the benefit of our Redeemer, and not to vs to guesse at it. Adde hereunto, that none can applie any thing by his contrary, as these Doctors do, that will haue God to apply the remission of our debts by making vs pay them, and the pardon in Iesus Christ by the punishment; as if a man should apply a medicine by poyson. Certainly, to apply the grace of God to a man by roasting him in a fire, is a strange kinde of application. The benefites of our Saviour are applied vnto vs by faith, Ephes. 3. 17. By Baptisme, Galat. 3. 27. By the holy Supper of our Lord, 1. Cor. 10. 18: but not with blowes with a whip, wasting of the spirits by a haire-cloth, or by a Monks coule.

3 They adde, that in all the workes of God, his Iustice as well as his Mercie must appeare; but Saint Iames, 2. 13; contradiceth that saying, *There shall be condemnation mercilesse to him that sheweth not mercie.* Then let vs say the like, that *there shall be mercie without iudgement to him that shall shew mercie.* And as Saint Paul saith, Rom. 8. 1: *There is no condemnation to them that are in Christ Iesus.* If none, then neither eternall nor temporall. And yet the iustice of God hath euidently bene displayed against the sinnes of the children of God, by punishing them in Iesus Christ, who bare the punishment; and his mercie shewed by freely imputing that satisfaction vnto vs.

4 They also say, that after the King hath pardoned an offender, yet the partie offended is to be agreed withall. I answer, that that falls out so, because the King and the partie are two; but here God which is the King, is also the partie: who hauing remitted all that belongs to him, there is no more parties to content.

5 Their reason is no better, when they say that the King hauing granted an offender his life, neuerthelessse condemnes him to pay a great fine. For in that case (say they) the pardon
which

which the King giveth, is not a full pardon, but a diminishing of the punishment. But Gods pardon is full and entire, Colossi.

2. 13. *God freely forgiveth all our offences.* And 1. Iohn 1. 7. *The blood of Iesus Christ cleanseth vs from all sinne.*

*2. corinth. 5.
nisi sanguis
reus non
purgatur.*

6 They also bring in experience for a prooffe: for they say, that after God hath pardoned vs, he ceaseth not to punish vs. So *David* was punished by God after he had declared vnto him by the Prophet *Nathan*, that he had forgiven his offence, 2. Sam. 12. 13. And from thence Cardinall *Belarmine* in the tenth chapter of his first booke of Purgatorie inferreth, That Iesus Christ hath not fully satisfied for all the punishments of our finnes. * *If Christ* (saith he) *hath satisfied for all our fautes, and for all our punishments, why do we yet suffer so many evils after the fault is remitted?* This Prelate wrongs the Sonne of God, denying that his death is our full payment. But to answer to this obiection, I say it is nothing to the purpose, for the question is of satisfactory punishments: but the punishments suffered by *David* were chastisements; the one are punishments of a Iudge, the other the corrections of a father. The one serueth to make satisfaction to him that is offended, and to the iustice of the Iudge; the other to correct our vnrighteousnesse, and to amend a sinner. The chastisements wherewith God visiteth his children are benefits and spirituall medicines: they are exercises and not payments. Medicines are not satisfactions. A good father correcteth his children to make them better, and not to content himselfe and to satisfie his iustice. If our Aduersaries would belecue with vs, that God punisheth not his children, but with punishments of amendment and fatherly chastisements, Purgatorie would soone fall, where amendment hath no place. For they will haue Purgatorie to be a vengeance which God taketh for faults past, and not a warning for the time to come. The death of Iesus Christ serueth to exempt vs from satisfying the iustice of God by satisfactory punishments, but not to exempt vs from chastisements. For it ought not to serue to hurt vs, and to make vs incorrigible; but those whom God hath adopted in Iesus

** Si Christus
satisfecit pro
omni culpa &
pena nostra,
cur post remissionem cul-
pam adhuc
tam multa
mala patimur?*

Christ, are those whom he chastiseth most carefully for their instruction. So he chastened *Dauid*, who in supposing these fatherly corrections, neuer thought by that meanes to satisfie the iustice of God.

Maister Armon, to make vs odious, faith, that by abolishing our owne satisfactions and merites, we pull the spirit of penitence out of our hearts, and drowne the soule in the bog of fleshfulnesse and negligence of good workes; &c. On the contrary, I maintaine, that there is nothing which more stirreth vp and wakeneth repentance, nor that inciteth a man more to feare God and loue him, then the memorie of our free redemption by Iesus Christ, and of our full reconciliation. The true motiue vnto pietie, is not the ambition of merites, or of paying God with our owne: nor the feare of a fire after this life, but a filiall loue, kindled by the acknowledging of his loue. He that serueth God onely for feare of punishment, is moued thereunto by a seruile feare; and not by a filiall loue. God sheweth great clemencie vnto such a man, if he punisheth him not for his seruice. Therefore, the Scripture that speaketh of free pardon, and of redemption in Iesus Christ, ordinarily from thence draweth exhortations to feare God, and to liue holily. *Dauid*, in the hundred and thirtieth Psalm, verse the fourth, faith, *But there is forgiveness with thee, that thou mayest be feared.* And *Saint Paul* Rom. 12. 1. exhorteth vs by the mercies of God to offer and consecrate our bodies

Tit. 2. 11, 12. vnto the Lord. For (saith he) in another place: *The grace of God that brings saluation vnto all men hath appeared, and teacheth vs, that we should deny vngodlinesse and worldly lust, and that we should liue soberly, righteously, and godly in this present world.* Iesus Christ hath redeemed vs, to the end that we should serue him: his fauour is not a prophane impunitie: Christian liberty is not a licence: peace of conscience is not a carnall sluggishnesse. The Apostle saith, Iesus Christ cannot be diuided: but it is a diuiding of him; if we will haue him for a Redeemer and not for a Maister; to participate in his promises, in reiecting his commandements, 1. Peter 2. 24. *He hath borne our sin in his body on the tree, that we being dead to sin should*

2. Cor. 1. 13.

Should live vnto righteousnesse.

We see not any where but in the Romish church where humane satisfactions are preached, that by that meanes vice is diminished; for the church of Rome is the onely church in the world where vice is become a law, and where by publike ordinances the Stewes are erected, whoredome permitted, and marriage forbidden. There is none but the Romish church, wherein by lawes and decrees the people are taught to be rebels to their Prince, and not to keepe faith with those that are excommunicated, and where a trafficke of sacred things is publicly established.

8 All this abuse is grounded vpon a most pernicious maxime, which is one of the cankered vlcers of the church of Rome. This maxime is, that the punishment for sinne before Baptisme is remitted vnto vs by Baptisme; but that for the punishment of sinnes committed after Baptisme, we are to satisfie for them by penall workes and satisfactorie penance, aswell in this life as in Purgatorie. A new Gospell, whereof there is not found one print or tract in all the word of God. The Councell of Trent in the fourteenth Session, eight chapter, to defend this doctrine, saith, That it seemes that the iustice of God requireth, that those that before Baptisme haue sinned by ignorance, should be more fauourably vsed then those that haue sinned voluntarily after Baptisme. But these Fathers by saying so condemne themselves. For, may it not fall out, that some may sinne maliciously before Baptisme: and on the contrary, that after Baptisme they may sinne by ignorance or infirmitie? In this case what apparence is there, that God will not exact any satisfactorie punishment for sins committed of deliberate malice, and will axact them for sins committed by ignorance or of infirmitie? And which is more, may it not happen, that a man should cause himselfe fainedly or for gaine to be baptized, and yet in his heart is an enemy to the Name of Christ? Is it a iust thing, that hypocrisie should be auailable vnto him, and that for mocking of God, all his sinnes committed before baptism should be pardoned, without any penance or satisfaction?

To

To conclude, the blood of Iesus Christ cleanseth all our finnes, 1. Iohn 1. 7. Then as well finnes before baptisme, as finnes after baptisme. By Iesus Christ God pardoneth all our offences, Colos. 2. 13. This word, all, alloweth no exception, Saint Paul to the Galat. chap. 3. 17. saith, *That all those that are baptized haue put on Christ.* By this word *put on*, he sheweth vs, that the fruite of baptisme is specially for the time after baptisme, for we put on clothes for the time to come.

ARNOX.

39. *Sol.*

Places of the Scripture noted in the margent of the Confession. Hebrews 9. 14. How much more shall the blood of Christ, which through the eternall Spirit offered himselfe without fault to God, purge your consciences from dead workes, to serue the living God! And 1. Peter 1. 18. 19. Knowing that you were not redeemed with corruptible things, as silver and gold, from your vaine conversation received by tradition from your Fathers: but with the precious blood of Christ.

In these two places there is not one word spoken of satisfaction, and the words of entire and perfect washing, under the which the venome is bidden, are not found therein: but here the Apostle ascribeth to the merits of Christ the vertue to purifie our consciences, to deliuer them from dead workes, to make vs serue the living God, and to redeeme vs from our vaine conversation.

MOVLIN.

It is true that in these places the word *Satisfaction* is not found, but the word *redeeme*, which is all one in effect; for our redemption by Iesus Christ is a satisfaction for vs. He that redeemeth a prisoner, by that redemption satisfieth for him. The word *wash* also is not there, but the word *cleanse*, which is all one, and is found in other places, as in Apoc. 1. 6. Touching the perfection and integritie of this redemption and washing, we haue before produced a great number of places to proue it. That which *M. Arnoux* addeth, that the merite of the Some of God purifieth our consciences, and deliuereth

To him that
hath loued vs
and washed
vs from our
finnes, &c.

liuereth them from dead workes, &c. is true, but to what end serues that to establish humane satisfaction?

*Of superabundant satisfactions, and whether the me-
rite of Christ is applied vnto vs by our
owne satisfactions.*

ARNOVX.

Contrary places of Scripture. Coloss. 1. 24. *Now reioyce I in my sufferings for you, and fulfill the rest of the afflictions of Christ in my flesh, for his bodies sake which is the Church.* 40. Sect.

It is not because the Sonne of God hath not abundantly satisfied, as touching the sufficiency of his paines and dolours infinitely meritorious, and of the smallest drop of his blood that was shed, which is much more worth then a thousand worlds: but the Apostle teacheth vs, that if we be not like Iesus Christ, and do not suffer with him following his example, his rich treasures of merit will serue vs for nothing, for want of being applied by our proper satisfactions, all which are the true and first effects of his death, by the which he hath merited grace for vs to do them, following his example.

MOVLIN.

Our aduersaries ordinarily alledge this place out of the first chapter of the Collossians, to proue that the Saints and Monkes make more satisfactions, and endure more paines then they need to satisfie for themselves; whereupon they inferre, that the same is meritorious for others. Therefore *Bel. larmine* in the fourth chapter and first booke of Indulgences, saith, that the Saints in some manner are our redeemers, Therefore also the Canon of the Masse requireth aide of God, not onely by the prayers of Saints, but also by their merits. Which is a new Gospell, and a meere profanation of the doctrine of saluation, whereby they will haue God to receiue and accept the superabundant stripes and fastings of S. Francis, or of S. *Quorum pra-*
cibus meritis
the rogation
or.

Domi-

Dominicke, in recompence for our sinnes, as if a Iudge should discharge and set a prisoner free, because his brother was whipt for him. How can he haue any remnant or superfluitie of merite, that hath need of pardon? How can he satisfie for another, that cannot satisfie for himselfe?

But *M. Arnonx* dares not stirre this filthy puddle, but contents himselfe to alledge this place to support humane satisfactions, presupposing that *S. Paul* by his sufferings made satisfaction vnto God: which is false, for in this place there is neither trace nor footstep thereof to be seene. It is true that *S. Paul* suffered for the Church, but not to make satisfaction for the Church, but to edifie and confirme the Church, as *Lambardus*, *Anselmus*, and *Thomas* expound it in their Commentaries vpon this place, conformable to that which the said Apostle saith to the Philippians, 1. 12. The rest of the afflictions of Christ, which are not yet accomplished, are the afflictions of the Church, which Iesus Christ saith are his, *Acts* 9. 4. *Saul, Saul* (saith he) *why persecutest thou me?* And *Matth* 23. 40. *In as much as ye haue done it vnto one of the least of these my brethren, ye haue done it to me.* That which our Doctor saith, that we must suffer according to the example of Iesus Christ, is true, but not thereby to satisfie Gods iudgements, or to content his iustice. It is to steepe the afflictions for Iesus Christ into bitternesse, and to make them intollerable, if we make them payments, satisfactions, and penances to appease and content the iustice of God: whereas they are the liveries of Christian souldiers, an honourable opprobrie, and a conformitie to the Sonne of God. It is no glorie to be punished: but it is an honour to fight after Iesus Christ, and for Iesus Christ.

Touching that which *M. Arnonx* saith, that the merits of our Saniour must be applied vnto vs by our owne satisfactions, it is an inuention forged vpon the anuill of routousnesse, and blowne with the bellows of pride, without the word of God, to the which belongeth the authoritie to prescribe the manner how to apply Iesus Christ vnto vs, and not to vs to inuent the meanes. Behold the meanes which in
giueth

glueth vs to apply Iesus Christ vnto vs. First by baptisme, Galat. 3. 27. *For all ye that are baptized into Christ, haue put on Christ.* Secondly, by the holy Supper, 1. Cor. 10. 16. *The bread which we breake, is it not the communion of the body of Christ?* Thirdly by faith. Ephel. 3. 12. *By whom we haue boldnesse and entrance with confidence, by faith in him.* And this faith is by hearing of the word of God, Rom. 10. 17. But to apply Iesus Christ vnto vs by suffering paines and torments in this life, or in Purgatory, the word of God speaketh not at all. The reason is most manifest; for we do not apply a thing by the contrary thereof, as the Church of Rome doth, that will haue God to apply grace and pardon of sinnes freely vnto vs by punishing vs: and that God applieth the remission of our debts vnto vs, by making vs to pay them: that is not to apply, but to cut off and drie vp this grace. Is not this a notable application, to burne a man two or three thousand yeares in a fire? And yet to intoxicate our braines, they place this fire among the graces of God: they will haue the bloud of Iesus Christ to giue vertue to this fire to be a satisfaction. In the end we shall find by their doctrine, that the diuels are Gods minions: for God sheweth them the fauour to satisfie to the full, and by that meanes they haue this aduantage, not to be much bound vnto him.

ARNOVX.

And Romans 12. 1. I beseech you therefore brethren, by the mercies of God, that you giue vp your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable vnto God, which is your reasonable seruing of God. 41. Self.

ARNOVX.

I cannot conceiue how this place serueth for humane satisfactions. Saint Paul by this holy and pleasing sacrifice to God, vnderstandeth our good workes, but not corporall or pecuniary punishments which make amends or satisfie for our sinnes. Our good workes are sacrifices of thanksgiuing, and not expiatory punishments, to recompence or satisfie the iustice of God.

THE

THE EIGHTEENTH ARTICLE.

We belecue that all our righteoufnesse is grounded vpon the remission of our finnes, as also our whole felicitie, as *Dauid* saith. Therefore we reiect all other meanes to iustifie vs before God, and without presuming of any merits or vertues, we simply and wholly depend vpon the obedience of Iesus Christ, which is allowed vnto vs, as well to couer all our faults, as to make vs find grace and fauour before God. And to conclude, we belecue, that declining, how little soeuer it be, from this foundation, we can find no rest nor comfort elsewhere, but rather are continually disquieted in mind, because we are neuer at peace with God, vnill such time as that we are fully resolved that we are beloued in Iesus Christ, seeing that of our selues we are worthy to be hated.

THE NINETEENTH ARTICLE.

We belecue that by this meanes we haue free liberty and priuiledge to call vpon God, with full assurance that he will shew himselfe to be our Father. For we shall haue no accessse vnto the Father, if we be not directed by this Mediatour; and that to be heard in his name, it behoueth vs to hold our liues of him, as of our head.

The aduersary saith nothing to these two points, as finding nothing therein worthy reprehension.

THE TWENTIETH ARTICLE.

Of Iustification by faith, and what true faith is.

We beleue that we are made partakers of this righteousness onely by faith, as it is said that he suffered to obtaine saluation for vs, to the end that whosoever shall beleue in him, shall not perish: and that the same is done, for as much as the promises of life which are made vnto vs in him are appropriated to our vse, and we feele the effect thereof when we accept them, nor doubting, that being assured by the mouth of God, we shall not be frustrated thereof. So the iustice which we obtaine by faith, dependeth vpon free promises, by the which God signifieth and declareth vnto vs, that he loueth vs.

ARNOV.

Herein they still contend and strine against charitie, and the exercise of vertues, vnder the name of faith, to fill the soule with a vaine presumption which hath no ground in the Scripture, and consisteth (according to their opinion) in firmly beleeuing and trusting without any doubt, that they are as well assured of the kingdome of heauen as Iesui Christ himselfe. So Calvin teacheth in the fourth booke of his Institutions. cap. 17. sect. 2. saying, In the Catholicke Church we truly hold, that without true faith we cannot please God, nor be righteous; and that faith is the roote of the tree, and the foundation of the house. But if it be not working by charitie, it is an house without rooffe, and a tree without fruite: and neither the one nor the other are seruiceable to the maister.

42. Sect.

*What faith is, and what it can be without hope,
and without knowledge.*

MOVLIN.

MOVLIN.

He speaketh of vs as of enemies vnto charitie and all vertue, and as if we contented our selues to belecue, and to haue a faith without works, and by consequence dead and vnpromisable. Cardinall Bellarmine purgeth vs of this slander in the third booke and sixt chapter of Iustification. *The aduersaries* (saith he) *do not deny, but that faith and repentance are requisite, that is, a lively faith, and an earnest repentance; and that without them no man can be iustified.* Whosoever is an enemy to charitie; whosoever saith that good workes are not necessary to saluation; and whosoever thinketh to be saved by a faith without workes, let him be accursed. In the meane time, this accusation made against vs, is very vnseemely in the mouth of the Church of Rome, wherein vices are in the last degree or ranke, specially in Rome, from whence, with the decisions of faith, comes examples of vices without example.

The originall of this abuse proceedeth from this, that our aduersaries know not what this word *faith* in the Scripture signifieth; and point and set forth vnto vs a false imagination for the true faith; for if they could discern and perceiue what faith is, they would behold it necessarily accompanied with vertue, and fruitfull in good workes.

The Councell of ^a Trent in the tenth Canon of the sixt Session, pronounceth a curse vnto those that say, that *insuffying faith is no other thing but hope in the mercie of God, that pardoneth our finnes in Iesus Christ.* And Bellarmine in the first booke and fift chapter of Iustification ^b saith, *that insuffying faith is not a hope that God will be mercifull vnto vs, but onely a firme consenting vnto all that which God will haue to be beleued.* Touching the affiance whereby some men particularly perswade themselves that God will be mercifull vnto them, he saith at the end of the chapter ^c that it is rather a presumption. And to make an end of painting out of faith, he bereaueth it of knowledge: and in the seventh chapter maintaineth: ^d *that faith is not a knowledge, but a consenting; and that, Fides melius per ignorantiam quam per*

notitiam

^a Si quis dicat
fidei fidem iusti-
ficantem nihil
aliud esse quā
fiduciam di-
uinae miseri-
cordiae peccata
remittentis
propter Chri-
stum, Ana-
thema sit.
^b Probatur
fidem iustifi-
cantem non
esse fiduciam
miseri-
cordiae
Dei, sed solum
assensum fir-
mam ac cer-
tum, ad ea om-
nia quae Deus
credenda pro-
ponit.
^c Catholicis
coram pro-
missionem spe-
culi miseri-
cordiae, ut tam
ad fidem quā
ad presump-
tionem per-
tineat comen-
dant.
^d Probatur fi-
dem non esse
notitiam, sed
assensum.

notitiam definitur: That faith is better defined by ignorance then by knowledge. For the Church of Rome will haue the people to beleue without knowledge, and to referre themselves therein to the Church, without knowing what the Church beleueth, or what it ought to beleue.

This is the ground of the mischiefe For seeing that our aduersaries by *faith*, vnderstand a consenting to an vknowne doctrine, which onely beleueth that all that which God hath said is true, without knowing what it is, and without confidence in his promise, it is no manuell that they seeke for their iustification in another thing, and not in faith: and that *M. Arnon* thinketh, that to extoll faith, is to fight against charitie and the exercise of vertues. For there is nothing found in faith (as the Church of Rome defineth it) which may not be found in diuers prophane persons, yea euen in the diuels themselves, who beleue that all that which God hath said is true, and consent thereunto: for faith without knowledge is a voluntary blindness vnder shadow of docility. To know the promise of God, and not to beleue it, is an iniury done vnto God, and matter of torment and disquietnesse of conscience.

The word of God describeth faith vnto vs in a contrarie manner. For Iesus Christ not onely faith, *Beleue me*, but *beleeue in me*, Iohn 14. 1. Now to beleue in Iesus Christ, is to put our trust in him. And in Rom. 4. 10. *Abrahams* faith is described by this, that he made no doubt of the promise of God with distrust, but was strengthened in faith. And *Abraham* is called the father of the faithfull: that his faith may be an example to conforme vs thereunto. Saint *James* 1. 6. will haue the faithfull pray in feith, and wauer not: for that faith in prayer excludeth doubt and distrust to be heard. And in Matth. 8. 26. When the disciples were afraid to be drowned, although Iesus Christ was with them in the ship, he rebuked them, saying, *Why are ye fearefull o ye of little faith?* Here there was no question made of consenting, but of trusting in the aide and succour of Iesus Christ: for feare fighteth directly against confidence.

How often doth the holy Scripture attribute effects vnto faith which cannot agree to a simple consent without trust to the promise of God? Iesus Christ in the Gospell an hundred times at the least vrigeth, that *He that beleaueth in him hath life euermlasting*, Iohn 6. 47. And *S. Paul* Rom. 1. 17. saith, *that the iust shall liue by faith*. And in the fifth Chapter he saith, *that being iustified by faith, we haue peace towards God*: making peace of conscience to spring from faith. All these things are false, if the Romish definition of faith be true: for all those which beleue that all that which God hath said is true, haue not life eternall, for then the diuels should be saued. To yeeld a consent to the doctrine of the Gospell, and not to trust in the promise of God, procureth not peace of conscience, but rather trouble and perplexitie.

Therefore *Saint Paul*, 1. Cor. 1. 1. who will haue vs to be followers of him, bindeth vs by his example, to speake as he doth, and particularly to apply vnto our selues the promises of the Gospell, by saying as he saith, 1. Tim. 1. 15. *This is a true saying, and by all meanes worthy to be receiued, that Christ came into the world to saue sinners, of whom I am chiefe*. By saying *This is a true saying*, he consenteth to the doctrine of the Gospell; but by adding, *I was receiued to mercy*, he applyeth the promise of God (with a firme confidence) particularly to himselfe. And so Galat. 2. 20. he saith, *The Sonne of God loueth me and hath giuen himselfe for me*. Otherwise that which he saith, Ephes. 3. 12. *that we haue boldnesse and entrance with confidence by faith in Iesus Christ*, should be false. For can a man approach vnto God with confidence, if he distrusteth his promise? Thereby it appeareth that the Councell of Trent aforesaid cursed and excommunicated the Apostle, by excommunicating those that haue a particular affiance in the mercy and promise of God. The like abuse it is to make a iustifying faith without knowledge, and to haue a man to beleue without knowing; seeing that on the contrary, we must first haue knowledge to beleue, that we may know what we beleue. To haue a man to beleue before he knoweth, is as much as to put out a mans eyes before we leade him. To be-
leue

Iecue so, is to belecue we know not what, and onely to haue a good opinion of him that leadech vs. But the Scripture dorth ioyne faith with knowledge; Iohn 17. 8. *They haue knowne surely, that I came out from thee, and haue beleened that thou hast sent me.* And Iohn 10. 38. *This ye may know and beleene, that the Father is in me: and I in him.* And Iohn 6. 69. *And we beleene and know, that thou art that Christ.* For faith cometh by hearing of the word of God, Rom. 10. And we heare the word of God to know it, and to be instructed therein. And knowledge is so necessary in faith, that sometimes the word *Knowledge* is set in the place of faith: as in *Esay* 53. 11. whereas the Apostle ordinarily faith, that we are iustified by faith in Iesus Christ, it is there said, that *He shall iustifie many, by the knowledge which they shall haue of him.*

Then this faith which is moned by knowledge, and which entirely trusteth in the promise of God, necessarily abounds in good workes: For, from the knowledge of the loue which God beareth vnto vs, proceedeth our loue towards God. And it is altogether impossible to trust in the promise of God without louing him. True faith is discerned from false, when it worketh by charitie, when it is ioyned with earnest and heartie repentance: when it is humble, and trusteth not in her owne merits, but in the promise of God in Iesus Christ, and when it kindleth zeale and the loue of God.

If *M. Arnoux* had vnderstood what this word *Faith* importeth, and what the nature of true iustifying faith is, he would neuer say, that we placing our Iustification in Faith onely, make men negligent and carelesse of good workes. He should rather take heed, that vnder pretence of conamending charitie, he ouerthroweth not faith: and that vnder a shadow of fearing God, he doth not reiect his grace, thinking to merite saluation by his owne righteousness.

As touching *Caluine*, whom *M. Arnoux* alledgeth, he neuer said, that he himsele, or any particular person, was as well assured of the kingdome of heauen as Iesus Christ himsele is. He speaketh there of the body of the Church; con-

sisting of the Elect, which can no more perish then Christ himselfe, because it is one body with him. In such manner notwithstanding that all the firmnesse & beatitude of the Church dependeth on Iesus Christ, This is not to equalize or compare the Church to Iesus Christ, but to say that it is ioyned vnto Iesus Christ by an inseparable band.

Of Iustification onely by faith: and of the word Iustifie.

ARNOVL.

43. Sect.

Places of the Scripture quoted in the margent of the Confession. Rom. 3. 28. Therefore we conclude, that a man is iustified by faith, without the workes of the Law. And Galat. 3. 24. Wherefore the Law was our Schoolemaister to bring vs to Christ, that we might be made righteous by faith. And Chap. 2. 16. Know that a man is not iustified by the workes of the Law, but onely by faith in Iesus Christ.

In the first and second of these places, the word onely is not there; and in the third, the word onely doth not in any sort exclude the workes of the morall and Christian Law, by the which Abraham and his children according to the Spirit are iustified, saith Saint Iames; but those of the ceremoniall and figurative Law of Moses, which ceased when the Sonne of God entred into the world. As the posts or props of wood serue no more for any vse after the bridge of stone is perfectly built.

MOVLIN.

To say that a man is iustified by faith onely, and to say that a man is iustified by faith without workes, are all one thing. For euen as in the question, whether the man or the woman ought to be master, he that saith the man ought to be maister in the house, and not the wife, saith also that the man ought onely to be maister. So in the question, whether man is iustified by faith or by workes, or by the one and the others
he

he that saith, that man is iustified by faith without works, by consequent faith, that man is iustified by faith onely. To stay vpon the words where the thing is cleare, is as much as to fly the truth. So the ancient Fathers vnderstood it. Origen vpon the third Chapter to the Romans saith, *The Apostle saith, that Iustification by faith onely is sufficient.* ^a Basil in his Sermon of Humilitie, saith, *The Apostle Saint Paul acknowledgeth himselfe to be poore concerning true righteousness, and that he was iustified by faith onely in Iesus Christ.* Saint Hillarie in the eight Canon vpon Matthew saith, *Fides sola iustificat*, Faith onely iustificieth. Chrysostome in the homily of Faith and of the law of Nature saith, *Faith onely of it selfe saueth.* Saint Hierome vpon the third Chapter of the Epistle to the Galathians saith, *Because no man obserueth the Law, therefore it is said, that the faithfull ought to be iustified by faith onely.* And a little after, *To the end that by faith onely all nations should be blessed in Christ.* Bernard in the two and twentieth Sermon vpon the Canticles, saith, *Being iustified by faith onely, we shall haue peace towards God.*

Our Doctor wrongeth himselfe to thinke that the works which Saint Paul excludeth are the workes of the ceremoniall Law. In the third Chapter to the Romans, verse twenty seuen, the Apostle concludeth, that *Man is iustified by faith without the workes of the Law*: he there speaks of the morall law, by the which in the Chapter before, verse the x. he said, that *Those that shall haue sinned shall be iudged*: and of the same Law he there saith, that *The Gentiles which haue not the Law, do by nature the things contained in the Law*, because they haue natural impressions thereof; the which Law in the same Chapter saith the Iewes had transgressed by stealing, and by committing adulterie: which cannot haue reference but to the morall Law. And in the fourth Chapter he insisteth to proue, that *Abraham* was not iustified by workes. It had bene in vaine for him to proue that *Abraham* was not iustified by the workes of the ceremoniall Law, seeing that the ceremoniall Law was not then made, neither was it giuen vntill foure hundred yeares after.

a. Apostolus
dicit sufficere
solum fides
iustificationem.
b. ad Romanos
scriptum est
quod sola fides
iustificat.
c. Quia nemo
illam seruat,
ideo dictum
est, quod sola
fide iustificamur.
d. Per sola fide
beneficentur
gentes in Chri-
sto.

Touching the Epistle to the Galathians, it is manifest that Saint Paul in the second Chapter, saying, that *Adam is justified by faith, and not by the workes of the Law*, excludeth from Iustification; not onely the workes of the ceremoniall, but also those of the morall Law. For in the fifth Chapter and fourteenth verse, he saith: *For all the Law is fulfilled in one word, which is this: Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thy selfe.* And in the third Chapter and tenth verse he saith, that Iesus Christ hath delivered vs from the curse of the Law, even from that Law which saith, *Cursed is every man which continueth not in all things which are written in the booke of this Law to do them:* which is a place taken out of the seven and twentieth Chapter of Deuteronomie, verse 26. where it is spoken onely of the morall Law.

Notwithstanding we do not abolish good workes, although we exclude them from our iustification. No man can be iustified without workes, although he shall not be iustified by workes: even as the eyes are not without the eares, and yet the eyes onely see, and not the eares. For faith onely hath the vertue to iustifie vs, that is, to cause vs to be absolved and accounted iust before the iudgement seate of God, because faith onely hath this proprietie, to apprehend the benefit of Iesus Christ, and to appropriate his righteousness vnto vs.

Now that which troubleth our Aduersaries in this question, is, that the word *Faith*, and also the word *Iustifie*, by them is taken in another sence then it is meant in the Scripture, as often as it speaketh of our iustification before God. For the Councell of Trent in the sixt Session, and all our Aduersaries, by *iustifying* vnderstand *regenerating* and *sanctifying*; whereas the holy Scripture, when it speaketh of our iustification before God, alwayes taketh the word *Iustifying* for *absolving*, in the same sence that a man accused of a crime, is dismissed, being absolved and iustified. That appeareth by this, that iustifying is opposed against condemning, and consequently is as much as absolving. As in Prouerbes, Chapter 17. verse 15. *He that iustificth the wicked, and he that condemneth the iust,*

uent they both are abomination to the Lord. And Iob Chapter 9. verse 20. *If I iustifie my selfe, mine owne mouth shall condemne me.* And Dent. 25. 1. *Then they shall iustifie the righteous, and condemne the wicked.* And Math. 12. 27. *By thy words thou shalt be iustified, and by thy words thou shalt be condemned.* And Rom. 8. 33. *It is God that iustificeth, who shall condemne?*

It is manifest by the first of the Corinthians, Chapter 4. ver. 4. what the Apostle vnderstandeth by *iustificing*; and how he maketh account to be iustified. Speaking of his administration in his Apostleship, he saith: *For I know nothing by my selfe, yet am I not thereby iustified.* He maketh not account to be iustified by his innocencie, which should be false; if by iustification he vnderstood holinesse of life, or regeneration; or if he pretended to be iustified by his workes. And in Matth. Chap. 11. verse 19. it is said that *Wisedome is iustified of her children.* Will our Aduersaries say, that the wisedome of God was regenerated or sanctified? It is most manifest that Iesus Christ would onely say, That the wisedome of God was acknowledged to be iust, and exempted from the slanders of men.

If man be iustified by the workes of the Law, Saint Paul did wrong to magnifie with David, *the blessednesse of those men to whom God imputeth righteousness without workes*, Rom. 4. 6. especially seeing that there he speaketh of the workes of Abraham and of David, then when they were already in Gods fauour. For these causes you shall finde that Saint Paul neuer exhorteth vs to be iustified, because Iustification is not a vertue in man, but a grace of God, whereby he absolueh sinners in beholding his Sonne. But his Epistles are full of exhortations to be sanctified and renewed, Romanes Chapter 12. vers. 1. 2. And therefore Romans Chapter 5. ver. 9. he saith, that *We are iustified by the blood of Iesus Christ.* And if by iustificing he vnderstood sanctifying or regenerating, he would rather say, that we are iustified by the Spirit of Christ.

How

How according to Saint James, man is iustified by workes.

ARNOUX.

44. Sol.

Contrary places of Scripture. James 2. 24. You see then, how that by workes a man is iustified, and not by faith onely.

I alledge this Apostle, whose Epistle, and this place, by them is acknowledged to be canonical. Can he more clearly and more manifestly contradict their article? and doe they yet make mention of their onely faith, altogether voyd, altogether barren, and altogether dead?

MOULIN.

It is true that we speake of faith onely, altogether barren or bare, &c. but in decesting it as a shew of faith, a spirituall drowinesse, and a prophane sluggishnesse.

As for the place of Saint James, it is nothing to the purpose; for in this question we speake of our Iustification before God, but Saint James speakes of our iustification before men? Shew me (saith he) thy faith by thy workes. He speakes of making our faith appeare vnto men by our workes. But as touching Iustification before God, the Apostle Saint Paul declareth, that Abraham was not iustified by workes: For if (saith he) Abraham were iustified by workes, he hath wherein to riouee, but not with God. And if Saint James intent had bene to proue that Abraham was iustified before God by workes, he would not haue contented himselfe to set downe the onely sacrifice of Isaac, but would haue shewed the entire course of his obedience during his life. For if a man be iustified before God by workes, it should not be by one onely action, but by the continuance of an holy and innocent life. M. Arnoux seeketh to proue that Saint James speaketh here of faith and of workes, as farre as they serue to saluation, which we willingly confesse. He saith also, that these words

not only, shew that Saint James speaketh of the same sort of Iustification, Wherein he is mistaken. If I say, that a man is learned, not only in Philosophie, but also in Diuinitie, doth it follow, that Philosophie and Diuinitie are all one kind of learning?

ARNOVL.

And what doth the Sonne of God meane, Luke 7. 47. when he speaketh of Marie Magdalen, so Simon that erred in faith, Many Iames are forgiven her, for she loved much: to whom a litle is forgiven, he dasheth litle.

45. Sect.

There was Marie Magdalen iustified only by faith, or haply did not the Sonne of God vnderstand the myserie of saluation so well as the Ministers?

MOVLIN.

This place is nothing to the purpose, and speaketh not of iustification by workes. Note also that our aduersaries by iustification, vnderstand sanctification or regeneration: and so the end whereunto they aime, is to proue that we are regenerated by workes; a thing which we willingly grant. The question is, if by our workes we can stand before the iudgement seate of God, and be iustified before God: which is not spoken of in this place. *Dauid* cutteth them off clearely touching that, Psal. 143. verse 2. where he saith, *No man liuing can be iustified before God.*

Some alledge the place in Luke 7. 47. to ground their merits, supposing that the word *for*, importeth a cause of iustification; whereas it is onely a marke. Of that we will speake more hereafter.

Of the Certaintie of saluation, and of perseuerance.

ARNOVL.

In the same Article, somewhat lower, after they have said, that we are iustified by faith onely, they adde: That is done for that the promises

46. Sect.

promises of life which are given vs in him are appropriated to our use, and we feele the effects when we accept them, not doubting being assured by the word of God, that we shall be frustrated thereof. This is alwaies to assure every man of his salvation, and to ground the interiour peace of conscience of the faithfull upon presumptions which makes men live without feare, and carelesse of the time to come, as if a man were already in possession. But what is he among them, who if he have his right wits, soundly and dividly in his assurance, freed of all fears? We may well persuade and assure our selves, that God will hold his promise, but we cannot assure our selves of the use of his particular will, whereof God in the Scriptures giueth not any infallible promise vnto any man.

MOVLIN.

Now we enter into the question touching the assurance of man to be saued, which is a point wherein our aduersaries disgrace our Confession, and propound it otherwise then it is. They say that every one of vs boast and brag, that we haue a particular reuelation thereof, and that among vs euery one assureth himselfe of his salvation. All that is false. For, to be assured of our salvation, we need not to enter into the secreet counsell of God. Whosoever seeketh by curiositie to enter into it, shall therein find his condemnation. Whosoever will presume to climbe so high, shall be throwne downe by despair. The certaintie of our salvation ought not to be sought for so faire off: it is found in the examination of our owne consciences, conformed with the doctrine of the Scriptures. For if being seriously conuicted by true repentance we haue recourse to Iesus Christ, and feele in our consciences that we haue no other hope nor affiance but in his death and passion, we haue the doctrine of the Gospell which declareth vnto vs, that whosoever beleaueth in him shall not perish, but haue eternall life, Ioh. 3. 15. This is the foundation of our assurance, and the support of our faith.

It is also false, that every one of vs boasteth that he is assured of his salvation. It is true that God commandeth vs to be assured thereof, but he wills vs not to boast, nor make
open

open profession of it: and we are not bound to beleefe those that brag thereof. For prophane persons may boast of it, who by a vaine confidence imagine they shall ascend vp into heauen; while in the meane time their vices weigh them downe to hell.

And which is more, this full certainty of faith, is a gift which God giueth not to all the faithfull at one time, nor in like measure; to some he giueth it sooner, to others later; to some onely at the houre of death, and there are some who by prayer and good works seeking to fortifie their faith, are nevertheless assailed with doubts touching the same, and haue not as yet that full confidence: who if they perceine any proceeding thereof in themselves, and in earnest desire to increase in this faith, we exhort them to take and esteeme that consist, which they seele within themselves, for a marke of their election.

Our Confession then consisteth in these two points: the one, that God will haue vs to be assured of the accomplishing of his promise: the other, that God giueth this assurance, to whom, when, and in what measure it pleaseth him, but specially at the houre of death: for then certainly it is most necessary.

This doctrine is grounded vpon the holy Scriptures. The Apostle Saint Paul, Rom. 8. 16. saith, *The Spirit of God witnesseth with our spirits that we are the children of God.* Can there be a more credible witness, then the Spirit of God? Can we without horror reade that which Bellarmine saith, Chap. 9. of his third booke of Iustification, *That the testimony of the holy Spirit is not certaine but by a coniectural certainty?* That is, an vncertaine certaintie. He that beleaueth in the Son of God, hath the witness of God in himselfe. 1. Ioh. 5. 10. Now we cannot without impietie accuse the testimonie of God of vncertaintie. If *M. Arnoux* doth not seele this testimonie in himselfe, it is better for him to haue a bad opinion of himselfe, then to contradict the word of God, or to seeke to measure other men by his owne elle, and to limit the grace of God in others by the euill estate of his owne conscience.

The

The Apostle to the Hebrewes, 3. 6. will haue vs to bold fast vnto the end the confidence and the glorie of the hope. And 4. 16. *Let vs therefore go boldly vnto the throne of grace, that we may receive mercy, and find grace to helpe in time of need.* And 10. 22. *Let vs draw neere with a true heart in assurance of faith.* For faith he, Ephes. 3. 12. *By Iesus Christ we haue boldnesse, and entrance with confidence by faith in him.* S. Iohn in his first Epistle and fift Chapter will haue vs to be assured of eternall life: *These things haue I written vnto you that believe in the name of the Sonne of God, that ye may know that ye haue life eternall.*

Let vs adde hereunto the promise of God, which is, to giue vs all things that we shall aske of him in the name of Iesus Christ, Ioh. 16. 23. *Let vs aske of him saluation and perseuerance in faith, for God promisseth to heare vs and therefore* Saint Iames 1. 6. *will haue vs to aske in faith and without doubt.* Therefore we must aske saluation of God without doubt or distrust.

Of this ranke are those places in the Scriptures which compare the testimony of the Spirit in the hearts of the faithful, to a seale, or an earnest penny to assure vs, Ephes. 1. 13. *Wherein also after that ye believed, ye were sealed with the holy Spirit of promise, which is the earnest of our inheritance: and 4. 30. And grieve not the holy Spirit, by whom ye are sealed vnto the day of redemption.* And 2. Cor. 1. 22. *Who hath also sealed vs, and hath giuen the earnest of the Spirit in our hearts.*

The Apostle Saint Paul, Rom. 8. 37. faith, *For I am assured that neither death, nor life, nor Angels, nor Principalities, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate vs from the loue of God which is in Iesus Christ our Lord.* For which cause also, going to die, he speaketh as if he had the prize in his owne hand, and as being ready to lay hold vpon the crowne: 2. Tim. 4. 7. 8. *I haue fought a good fight, and haue finished my course, I haue kept the faith: from henceforth is layd up for me the crowne of righteousness.* And a little after: *The Lord will deliuer me from every euill worke, and will preserve me to his heavenly kingdom.* Is there any thing fuller of assurance, then that which Iacob said lying on his death-bed, Genes. 49. 18. *I haue waited*

wasted for thy saluation o Lord: or then that of *Dauid's* words, *Psal. 17. 15. As for me I will behold thy face in righteousness, and shall be satisfied when I awake, with thy likeness:* and in *Psal. 49. 15. God will redeeme my soule from the power of the grave, for he shall receive me:* or the words of *Simeon* when he approached neare vnto death, *Luke 2. 29. Lord now lettest thou thy servant depart in peace according to thy word?*

All these holy seruants of God are condemned by the Councell of Trent, which saith thus in the sixt Session: *Who sooner shall say, that the regenerated and the righteous man is bound to beleue with certaine confidence that he is of the number of those that are predestinated, let him be accused.*

To accuse a man of presumption that obeyes God commanding vs to be assured, and which putteth his trust in the promise of God, is to contest and strue with God vnder the shadow of humilitie. This humility is prophane, and this modesty is iniurious vnto God. It is as if a man should say to God, It is true that thou hast promised me, but I am not worthy to beleue thy word: I am too base to trust in thy promise. To ground the assurance of our saluation vpon our merits, is presumption: but to ground our assurance vpon the promise of God, is faith and obedience.

Neuerthelesse, to proue that we may be incredulous with reason, *M. Arnoux* alledgeth two things. First, that we cannot assure our selues of the vse of our will. Whereunto I say, that God hath promised to gouerne our wils, * and to put his Law in our hearts, and to make vs that we shall not withdraw our selues from him, *Ierem. 32. 40.* And Iesus Christ saying, *Marke 13. 32. that False Christs shall arise, and false Prophets, shewing signes and wonders to deceiue, if it were possible, the very elect,* sheweth that the elect cannot be seduced with a small seduction, or irrecoverable. And God also promisseth to heare vs when we aske perseuerance of him. To conclude, so many places before alledged, which will haue vs to be assured of our saluation, presuppose that God also will haue vs to be assured that he will not forsake vs: for without that

* And I will make an euerlasting covenant with thee, that I will not turne away from them to do thee good: but I will put my feare in their hearts, that they shall not depart from me.

there

there can be no assurance.

The other reason alledged by *M. Arnoux* is, that God in the Scriptures makes no man any infallible promise. This reason is impious, and overthroweth all piety. For if *Henry* or *Charles* be not bound to be assured of his salvation, because it is not said in the Scripture, that *Henry* or *Charles* by name shall be saved, it followeth that those persons are not bound to be honest men, nor to feare God, because in the holy Scripture it is not said, that *Henry* or *Charles* ought to be honest men. As the generall rules of piety bind all particular persons: so the generall promise, that whosoever beleueth in Iesus Christ hath life euertlasting, assureth euery particular person thereof that beleueth in Iesus Christ, although his name be not specified in the Scripture.

Whether a man is saved and elected vpon condition that he shall beleene, and do good workes.

ARNOUX.

47. Sol.

Places of the Scripture noted in the margin of the Confession. *Matth. 17. 20.* And Iesus said vnto them, It is because of your unbelofe, for verily I say vnto you; if you haue faith as much as a graine of mustard seed, ye shall say vnto this mountaine, Remoue hence to yonder place, and it shall remoue, and nothing shall be impossible vnto you, *Iohn 3. 16.* For God so loued the world, that he hath giuen his onely begotten Sonne, that whosoener beleueth in him, should not perish, but haue euertlasting life. These two places containe conditionall propositions, and therefore insufficient to giue the pretended assurance. The one saith, If you beleene, the other saith Whosoener beleueth; but neither the one nor the other make any assurance, that such or such a particular person is endowed with true faith, nor that if he were so endowed, that he should perseuer. And the Sonne of God speaketh of a working faith: then where are the termes that containe in them a safe conuult of assurance?

MOVLIN.

MOVLIN.

It is the same obiection that we haue formerly cleared in the end of the last section. The Scripture nameth not particular persons, but giueth generall rules which binde them. We confesse that this proposition; *Whosoener beleueth in Iesus Christ hath life everlasting*, is conditionall, and that life eternall is giuen onely to those that beleue. But this condition is not doubtfull, because it dependeth vpon the counsell of God, and vpon his election, by the which he hath predestinated the elect to beleue, and to do good workes. The Scripture saith not, that God hath elected any one because he is faithfull, but that God hath giuen him grace to be faithfull, to the end that he should be saued. So Saint Paul, 1. Cor. 7. 25. saith not, that God determined to shew mercy vnto him if he were faithfull; but saith, *I haue obtained mercy of the Lord to be faithfull*. And Ephes. 1. 4. he saith not, that God hath elected vs, because he foresaw that we should be holy, but, *that we should be holy, and without blame before him in lone*. And Iohn 15. 16. *I haue chosen you, and ordained you, that you go and bring forth fruite*. And Rom. 8. 29. he saith, that God hath predestinated vs, *to be made like to the image of his Sonne*. Our faith and obedience is not a condition whereupon election dependeth, but an effect of election, and grace which God giueth to all those whom he hath elected to saluation. I ioyne faith with obedience, because faith it selfe in some respect is a kind of obedience, and because it worketh by charity, Galat. 5. 6. In the thirteenth of the Acts, the Apostle Saint Paul preached the Gospell in Antiochia. Of all his audience, those onely which were ordained to life everlasting beleueed, as it is said, verse 48. He saith not that those beleueed that were disposed or inclined to life eternall, but those that were ordained thereunto. This Greeke word *καταρτισμένοι* can be no otherwise interpreted, seeing that all of vs by nature are vndisposed and vnapt to apprehend saluation and faith.

ARNOVX.

Contrary places of Scripture. Eccles. 8. 14. There is another 48. Sect. vanity

vantie which is done upon the earth, that is, that there are wicked men that are as bold as if they had done the actions of the iust; but also I iudge this to be vaine.

MOVLIN.

M. Arnoux
falsification.

This place is all false. According to the Hebrew it is, *There is a vanity which is done upon the earth, that is, that there be iust men, unto whom it happeneth according to the worke of the wicked: againe there be wicked men to whom it happeneth according to the worke of the righteous; I say that this also is vanity.* This Doctor made his brags to confound our Confession by our owne Bibles, and now he serueth his turne with his owne Bible falsified and contrary to the Hebrew.

And say that this place were not falsified, yer it maketh nothing against vs, that acknowledge that there is a false, a prophane, and a barren trust or affiance in good workes, which benumeth the conscience, in stead of kindling loue & nourishing pietie therein.

Of the feare of the faithfull, and whether it derogatesh any thing from the certaintie of saluation.

ARNOUX.

49. Sol.

1. Cor. 9. 27. *I beate downe, and bring my body into subiection: lest by any means when I haue preached to others, I myselfe should be reprov'd.*

And if he did apprehend (as they say) nothing but the iudgement of men, he had no need to carrie his mortification so farre, as to tame and subiect his most inward and secret motions, and to pull downe the most lively and secret provocations of his flesh: but it had bene sufficient for him to haue vsed dissimulation, and some outward shew of pretended reformation. Now sith the Apostle trembled, where are those reedes of the desert, which say they are the pillars of the Temple.

MOVLIN.

MOVLIN.

This Doctor makes vs to say that Saint *Paul* did apprehend nothing but the iudgement of men, and goes about to confute a thing forged by himselfe, and which we beleue not. For on the contrary 1. Cor. 4. 3, he declareth: *I passe very little to be iudged by you, or of mans iudgement.* The Apostle feared to offend God, and to faile in his charge: which is a vigilant feare, and not a feare of the distrust of his saluation: whereof he speaketh as assured in the passages before alledged, Rom. 8. 37. and 2. Tim. 4. 7. and 8. 18. We ceasse not to trauell with care in things whereof the euent is sure. Iesus Christ auoyded dangers, although he know that his houre was not yet come. *Ezechias* had a promise to liue fifteene yeares more: and yet he ceassed not to eate, to attaine to that time. Saint *Paul*, Acts, 26. 31, had a promise of God, that he should scape shipwracke, & yet ceassed not to exhort the sailers to worke. So the faithfull man assured of his saluation, ceaseth not to trauell by those meanes that are fit to attaine thereunto. Which assurance is not grounded vpon his owne force, but vpon Gods promise. Euen as a child that learneth to go, when his father holds him by the hand, may be assured that he shall not fall; not because he is strong enough of himselfe, but because his father leades him: so it is with the faithfull, of whom it is said, Psal. 37. 24. *Though the iust man falleth, he shall not be utterly cast downe, for the Lord vpholdeth him with his hand.*

In the meane time, consider what these Doctors are, that preach incredulitie by modestie, and that fearing to be proud, will die in doubt whether they be the children of God or of the diuell. These are they that boast of their merits, yea of merits of equialence and of dignitie, as they say, to giue God so much for so much, lest he should complaine. But this is but a small matter; for they make superabundant and supererogatory merits, doing more then God would haue them to do, that they may giue him more then enough. And yet when all is done, they know not whether they shall go into heauen or into hell,

I haue fought
a good fight,
I haue finished my
course, I haue
kept the
faith, from
henceforth is
laid vp for me
the crowne of
righteousnes.

L

Then

Then here you see the difference betweene true and false religion, which is, that true religion fashioneth mens hearts to an humble confidence or assurance: but false religion formeth them to a proud distrust. Which pride as it is prophane, so also their distrust is most iust. For he that trusteth in his merits, careth not for assurance. For hauing laid his foundation in the aire, his expectation must of force hang in suspence. These Doctors teach men to trust in themselves, and to distrust God: hanging their spirits betweene feare and ambition, trembling with feare to thinke vpon hell, and in the meane time presuming to haue a degree of glorie in heauen above the common Saints, which degree by scholers is called *Auroreola*.

This error is nourished by couetousnesse and ambition. For from a people that are in a feare, a man may exact all what soeuer he will. We may easily feele in a mans purse that is amazed or asleepe. A man that beleeueth when he dieth that he shall go into Paradice, will not pay for Masses to be said when he is dead.

THE XXL ARTICLE.

*whereupon M. Arnonx disputeth of the certaintie
of Perseuerance.*

We beleue that we are illuminated in the faith by the secret grace of God, so that it is a free and particular gift which God giueth to those to whom he will, in such manner, that the faithfull haue not whereof to boast, being much more bound to obedience for being preferred before others, for that faith is not given vnto the faithfull for a while, to leade them into the good way, but to make them continue therein to the end. For as it consists in God to make the beginning,

so it is in him to finish it.

ARNOUX.

By these words they pretend, that he that once hath true faith, 50. Sect. never falleth, and that faith cannot be lost: that it is no more in mans liberty, after he hath received that grace of God to leave it: that by consequence he is confirmed in that grace: and in pursueth thereof in good workes, which a little after they say are necessarily ioyned to faith. Is not this after a sort to make every one of them without sinne? Alas! and where are those holy and constant persons to be found among them? And if there be any such, why do they wish Calvin teach, that all the workes of the faithfull deserve death?

MOVLIN.

He that will exactly examine the words of this 21 Article of our Confession, shall find nothing of all that which *M. Arnoux* maketh it to say. It doth not say, that all those that haue faith are assured to continue therein vnto the end, but that faith is giuen to continue to the end: which no man can contradict, but he that will haue a man to leaue and forsake the seruice of God after he hath once begun well. And to be short, in all this Article there is no mention made of the certainty of perseuerance.

Neuerthelesse although he wander out of the way, we will follow him by his steps, and manifest and explaine vnto the Reader the certainty of perseuerance.

First, we do not denie, that there is a faith for a time, and which perseuereth not to the end. The holy Scripture speaketh thereof in many places: as Math. 13. 20. Ioh. 2. 22. 23. Hebr. 6. 4. 5. 6. and in other places.

Secondly, we confesse and acknowledge, that the faith of the elect groweth by degrees, and that as it waxeth stronger, so the certainty of perseuerance increaseth. Yet while it increaseth, there is still some remnant of infirmitie in man, and the flesh suggesteth doubts, so that this certainty is not giuen to all the elect in like measure.

Onely we say, that whosoever turneth vnto God by true repentance, and by an vnfaigned faith hath apprehended the benefit of Iesus Christ and the promise of God, he ought to be assured and to belecue that God will not forsake him, and will giue him grace to perseuere: and that God will haue vs to haue this assurance, and promisseth vs perseverance: and that he giueth this assurance to his elect, to some sooner to others later, and in diuerse measure: but that specially he giueth it to his children at the houre of death.

This certaintie of perseverance is taught vnto vs in the word of God: Iere. 32. 39. 40. where God makes this promise, *I will giue them one heart, and one way, that they may feare me for ever: I will make an everlasting covenant with them, that I will not turne away from them, to do them good.*

Iesus Christ, Marke 13. 22. saith, that *False Christs shall arise, and false Prophets; and shall shew signes and wonders, to deceiue, if it were possible, the elect.* Shewing that the elect cannot finally be seduced, and by consequence shall perseuere vnto the end. Therefore the Apostle in the beginning of his Epistle to *Timus*, calleth this faith whereof we speake, the *faith of the elect*: to shew, that it can no more faile then election it selfe: whether it differ in kind, or in degree onely from temporall faith: yet the certaintie thereof is not grounded vpon his owne force, but vpon the continuall aide and assistance of God: and this assistance depends vpon election.

Iesus Christ, Ioh. 6. 39. saith, *This is the Fathers will which hath sent me, that of all which he hath giuen me, I should lose nothing.* Now those whom the Father hath giuen to Iesus Christ are the elect, whom seeing Iesus Christ promisseth not to lose but to keepe them alwayes, it is necessary that they should perseuere vnto the end.

Our Lord, Ioh. 4. 14. speaking of the Spirit which he giueth to those that are his, promisseth *To giue them water, whereof whosoever drinketh shall neuer be more athirst, but that it shall be in him a well of water springing vp vnto eternall life*: which cannot be without persevering to the end.

Saint *Paul* Rom. 8. 35. assureth himselfe of this perseverance,

rance, saying, *Who shall separate vs from the loue of Christ?* And a little after, 38. *For I am assured, that neither death, nor life, nor Angels, &c. shall be able to separate vs from the loue of God.* So Iesus Christ promisetht the gift of perseuerance to Saint Peter, Luk. 22. 32. when he saith vnto him, *I haue prayed for thee that thy faith faile not.*

In the first Psalme the faithfull are compared to a tree whose leaues neuer fall. Iesus Christ compareth them to a man that hath buile his house vpon a rocke, which standeth fast against all stormes and tempests, Matth. 7. 24. Saint Peter in his first Epistle, 1. 23. saith, that *The word of God dwelling in their hearts, is an vcorruptible seed, liuing and enduring for ever.* And before, verse 5. he said that *We are kept by the power of God, through faith, vnto saluation.*

To the same end it is said, that the true faithfull are oftentimes called members of Iesus Christ: for it is not to be beleueed, that Sathan can cut off or pull away the members of Iesus Christ, nor yet diminish his body. As also that the regeneration of the faithfull is called a birth, Iohn 3. 3. and a resurrection, Reuel. 20. 6. For this second birth cannot be made voyde by death. And the Spirit of God, Reuel. 20. 6. saith, *That the second death (which is damnation) hath no power on him that hath part in the first resurrection.* Now if a man truly regenerated could entirely lose faith and godlinesse, and after returne againe and be reestablished by repentance, besides this second birth whereof the Scripture speaketh, there should be a third and fourth birth, whereof the Scripture maketh no mention. And though we had not so many places of Scripture for the certainty of perseuerance, yet so many places alledged in the 46. Section, whereby God will haue vs to be assured of our saluation, do necessarily presuppose the assurance of perseuerance: for without it faith wauereth, and floateth in vncertaintie.

All this being grounded vpon the constant and vnuariable election; vpon the nature of God, whose gifts and callings are without repentance, Rom. 11. 29. vpon the promises of God before set downe: God dresseth that which he hath

planted. He giueth, because he hath formerly giuen. His first graces inuite and draw on those that follow, and are promiser for the time to come.

It may well fall out, that the faith of the faithfull hardly assailed, may sometime languish, as those that faint and fall into a swoone. So it hapned to *David*, *Salomon*, and Saint *Peter*, and to many faithfull seruants of God, whom yet God recovered againe out of their trance. For, that *David* in his fall did not wholly lose the Spirit of God, it appeareth by that which he himselfe saith, *Psal. 51. 11. Cast me not away from thy presence, and take not thy holy Spirit from me.* Then he had that Spirit still. And for *Salomon*, God himselfe, *2. Sam. 7. 14. 15.* promised, that *If he committed iniquitie, he would chasten him with the rod of men, but that his mercie should not depart from him.* Whereby it appeareth, that by this doctrine we do not make our selues without sinne, as *M. Arnonx* chargeth vs.

Howbeit this perseuerance, although it be necessarie, is neuerthelessse voluntary, and without constraint. In the 21. Section we haue shewed, that there are voluntary necessities, and that constraint and not necessity is repugnant to liberty. All of vs necessarily desire to be happy, and yet with freedome of will, It is not to be asked whether the Elect can resist the grace of God, for all of them for a time resist it, and of their owne nature can do no other thing. But God in his secret counsell hath decreed to bend their wils, that they will not resist vnto the end. That which *M. Arnonx* makes vs and *Caluin* say, that all the workes of the faithfull are worthy of death, is slanderous, and nothing to the purpose.

ARNONX,

§1. Sect.

Places of the Scripture quoted in the margin of the Confession. 1. Corin. 1. 8. 9. Who shall also confirme you vnto the end, that you may be blamelesse in the day of our Lord Iesus Chrst. God is faithfull, by whom you are called vnto the fellowship of his Sonne Iesus Chrst our Lord. Iude, 3. It was needfull for me to write vnto you, to exhort you, that you should earnestly contend for the maintenance.

tenance of the faith which was once given unto the Saints. And Rom. 11. 29. For the gifts and calling of God are without repentance. Note, he will strengthen you, because it is by him and not by your selves that you shall be constant, so you be constant, and there shall be no want in him, or on his part. He hath called you to the communion, that is not to say, that you shall continue therein; but if you continue therein he will be faithfull unto you, to give you that which he hath promised you. Faith hath once bene given to the Saints, is it therefore to be said, that it is for a time onely, or for ever, or without losing, or recovering it againe? To be short, the gifts and calling of God are without repentance, because God neuer recalleth that which he hath done. Thy destruction cometh of thy selfe & Israel.

Note, it shall
not want on
Gods part.

MOVLIN.

This is a blow on the naile, by our Aduersary giurn to three places of Scripture set downe in the margent of the 21. Article of our Confession, to shew that they are wrongly alledged to proue the certainty of perseuerance; which is as much as to fight against his owne shadow: for those places are not brought to proue the certainty of perseuerance, whereof there is nothing spoken in that Article.

Adde hereunto, that we haue already confuted that in the 47. Section, where we haue shewed that Gods decree to giue perseuerance to his Ele&t, is not a conditionall, but an absolute decree. And it were a contradiction to say, that God giueth perseuerance to the faithfull, if they perseuere: or to speake (as *M. Arnoux* saith) that by the grace of God they shall be constant, so they be constant. But specially he speaketh with a good grace, to say, that there shall be no wanting on Gods behalfe. This Doctor imagineth, that God saith vnto vs, Do your endeauour, and I will do mine: It is not my fault, but you hinder me from doing that which I would willingly do. This Diuinitie is hypochondriacall: and the example which he setteth downe in his answer is childish. If (saith he) I should say to a sicke person, Thy Physician will aide and not leave thee to the end, should it thence follow,

that the sick man cannot disobey the Physicians order? Surely God is not like the Physician that cannot give the will to his patient to suffer him to rule him: but God giueth his Spirit to his Elect, which desposeth them to obedience.

The place of Scripture; *Thy destruction cometh from thy selfe O Israel*, is not to the purpose touching the perseuerance of the Elect: for that is spoken of reprobates.

ARNOUX.

Contrarie places of Scripture. 1. Cor. 10. 12. Wherefore let him that thinketh he standeth, take heed lest he fall.

It may then be that he may fall, and he cannot fall vnlesse he stands; and if he stood, he had faith. Who then dares contradict Saint Paul, that he that hath faith cannot lose it?

51. Sol.

MOVLIN.

Saint Paul in that place speaketh to those that are presumptuous and negligent, and that trust in their owne strength, and faith vnto them, Let him that thinketh himselfe to be very sure and firme, take heed that he falleth nor into such faulkes whereby his presumption and weakenesse may be knowne. For by *falling* he vnderstandeth not to lose faith, as *M. Arnoux* imagineth, but to fall into faulkes, whereby his false trust may be conuincied. But to gratifie our Aduersarie, put the case that Saint Paul speakes to those that haue true faith. In that sence, I say that either the Apostle speaketh of finall falling, whence men neuer recover againe, or of faulkes whence men recover againe, and which sometimes befall the most holy men, as Saint Peter and David, &c. If he speake of faulkes whence men recover againe, this makes nothing against finall perseuerance, which we speake of here. If he speakes of finall falling, and whence men neuer recover againe, this instruction is not vnprofitable to those that are assured of their saluation. For those that truly stand vp-right, should not be carelesse of falling. The assurance that they haue to go into the kingdome of God hindereth them not from turning into the

the way to hell, but bindeth them to be warie thereof. For mans will ought to obey Gods decree. Those whom God hath ordained to perseuere vnto the end, ought to vse the meanes to attaine thereunto. He whom God hath preordained to liue an hundred yeares, should be carefull not to want food by his negligence. For the confidence which we haue that God will saue vs, is no cause of negligence. And to be short, to the end that no man should serue his turne with that place of Scripture. to weaken the certainty of perseuerance, Saint Paul addeth verse 13. *There hath no temptation taken you, but such as appertains to man; and God is faithfull, which will not suffer you to be tempted aboue that you be able, but will euē giue the issue with the temptation, that ye may be able to beare it.* By these words he strengtheneth them, with assurance that God will giue them grace to perseuere.

ARNOVE.

Philip. 2. 12. Make an end of your owne saluation with feare 53. Self. and trembling.

But why should he tremble that hath no feare, and knowes himselfe to be assured?

MOVLIN.

This feare and trembling is not the feare of hell, but a feare to offend God; it is a childlike feare, and not a feruile feare: a feare that quickeneth slownesse, and is not contrary to faith.

And although the Apostle should here speake of the feare of hell, what is that to the purpose? For who knoweth not, that the Apostle giueth instructions to all sorts of persons, and by consequence also vnto those that doubt of their saluation? To men that are not forward in godlinesse, the feare of hell serueth for a compulsion and a good restraint from euill. But this feare decreaseth as faith increaseth and taketh deeper roote, euē as scaffolds made about buildings, are by degrees pulled downe as the building goeth forward and is perfected.

THE XXII. ARTICLE.

*Whereupon M. Arnoux moueth the question, whether
faith can be without good workes.*

We beleeuethat by this faith we are regenerated to newnesse of life, being naturally slaues to sinne. Now by faith we receiue grace to liue holily and in the feare of God, by receiuing the promise which is giuen vnto vs by the Gospell, that is, that God will giue vs his holy Spirit. Thus faith not onely doth not quench the affection to liue well and holily, but begetteth and quickneth it in vs, necessarily producing good workes. And although God to accomplish our saluation doth regenerate vs, reforming vs to do good, neuertheless we confesse, that the good workes which we do by direction of the holy Ghost, are not required to iustifie vs, or to merit that God therefore should hold vs for his children: for that we should alwayes stote in doubt and vniquietnesse, if our consciences did not rest vpon the satisfaction whereby Iesus Christ hath freed vs before God.

ARONVS.

34. Sol.

If it be true, that he which hath faith necessarily doth good workes, it followeth, that he which doth not good workes cannot haue faith.

MOVLIN.

That is true, so that by faith we vnderstand a liuely faith, a true confidence in Iesus Christ, a confidence that is not grounded vpon our merits, but vpon the promise of God: a faith working by charitie, Galat. 5. 6. not the faith of the Romane Church,

Church, which onely beleeueth that all that which God hath said is true, which the Diuels also beleue: nor the faith of the people of the Church of Rome, that make profession to beleeeue all that which God hath said, without knowing what he hath said, and without being instructed in his word. Such a faith may be, and is ordinarily without good workes.

ARNOVX.

And which of the holiest and constantest Ministers dare firmly assure himselfe that he doth good workes, without being condemned of pride, lying, and follie, by his owne sellaries? And then none of them can assure themselves of faith, wanting good workes, which are the effects thereof.

55. Sect.

MOVLIN.

Not onely the Ministers, but the least and meanest of the people that loue and feare God, know well when they do good workes, and are well assured, and doubt not, but that such workes are pleasing and acceptable vnto God, and that he beareth with the imperfection and want that is in them for the loue of Iesus Christ. But they do not brag and boast, nor yet presume by them to merit of God. And therefore are not afraid to be condemned by any man, of pride, lying, or follie, because they make no man acquainted therewith, but rather condemne then iustifie themselves. *M. Arnoux* neither knoweth what we say, nor what our beleefe is, nor yet what his owne is.

ARNOVX.

These are manifest contradictions, to say that faith cannot be lost, that it is neuer without good workes, that a man is assured of his faith, and yet that he cannot assure himselfe of his workes.

56. Sect.

MOVLIN.

It is an easie thing with *M. Arnoux* to make vs to contradict our selues, by making vs say things which he knoweth well.

well that we say nor, and which we beleue not no more then he doth. It is certaine that he argueth not against our Confession, but against his owne fictions, and an imaginary confession. To know with what equity he dealeth with vs, let the Reader remember, that before in the fiftieth Section he saith that we make our selues without fault, that is, without sinne; and now he attributeth the contrary vnto vs, and maketh vs say, that the holiest Ministers dare not assure themselves that they do good workes. So before he reprocured vs, that we make a bare faith, voyde of good workes; but here he himselfe produceth our Confession, which saith, that faith necessarily produceth good workes. By this meanes he iustificieth vs, and silently confesseth that he hath slandered vs. Furthermore these things agree well together, for a man to haue a certaine confidence of faith accompanied with good workes, and yet not to trust in his owne good workes: for the more that a man trusteth in God, the more he distrusteth himselfe: the more that a man resteth vpon the merits of Iesus Christ, the more he renounceth his owne merits.

ARNOVL.

57. Sect.

Places of the Scripture quoted in the margent of the Confession.
Iames 2. 14. What availeth it my brethren, though a man saith he hath faith, when he hath no workes? can that faith saue him?
Galat. 5. 6. For in Iesus Christ neither circumcision availeth any thing, neither uncircumcision, nor any vertue, but faith which worketh by loue.
Iohn. 1. 2. 3. My little children, these things I write vnto you, that you sinne not. And hereby we are sure that we know him, if we keepe his commandements: And 5. 18. We know that whosoever is borne of God, sinneth not; but he that is begotten of God, keepeth himselfe, and that wicked one toucheth him not. And 3. 3. And every man that hath this hope in him, purgeth himselfe as he is pure.

In all these places of Scripture, there is not one word more or lesse, that signifieth that faith necessarily produceth good workes, and the word necessarily is neither in truth nor in appearance in any of them.

Haw

MOVLIN.

MOVLIN.

These places serue to proue that which our Confession saith, that is, that faith stirreth in vs an affection to liue well, and necessarily produceth good workes. The Scripture is full of proofes hereof. The Apostle to the Hebrewes, 12. 32. and 33. maketh a great rehearfall of the seruants of God, who by faith did worke righteousness. Saint Peter, Acts 15. 9. saith, that *God hath purified the hearts of the Gentiles by faith.* Saint Paul, Rom. 8. 1. saith, that *There is no condemnation to them that are in Christ Iesus, which walke not after the flesh but after the Spirit.* Adde bereunto the places quoted in the margin of our Confession, which *M. Arnoux* produceth; Iam. 2. 14. that *Faith without workes cannot saue.* Galat. 5. 6. that *Faith worketh by loue.* Which five places *M. Arnoux* confesseth that they say, that faith produceth good workes; onely he saith, that the word *necessarily* (which is in our Confession) is not found in any of them. I am ashamed to trouble my selfe with such childish things. If in our Confession we had said, that God is necessarily iust, *M. Arnoux* would haue quarrelled with vs about it, and would haue said, that the Scripture saith that God is iust, but saith not that he is necessarily iust. What? Is not the word of God necessarily true? And when the Apostle saith, that faith worketh by loue, is it not necessary that it should worke by loue, to be that faith whereof the Apostle speaketh? Is it probably onely or contingently that faith inciteth vs to good workes? That is not to speake like a man, nor vnto men.

ARNOUX.

Contrary places of Scripture. Titus 1. 16. They professe that they know God, but by workes denie him, and are abhominable and disobedient, and to every good worke reprobate. 38. Self.

MOVLIN.

Gideons bottels had bene as much to the purpose as this which he alledgeth: what makes that to proue that the faith
of

of the elect may be without good workes? Who knowes not that there is a false faith, and that many make a good profession, and are of an euill conuersation?

ARNOVX.

59. Self.

James 2. 14. If any one saith that he hath faith when he hath no workes, can that faith saue him?

We see well that he denieth not that faith cannot be without good workes, but onely that without workes it is of no value.

MOVLIN.

But Saint *James* saith evidently, that faith can be without good workes, because he speaketh of a dead faith, of an hypocriticall faith, of a faith like vnto that of the Church of Rome, by which a man beleeueth that the word of God is true, but beleueth not that the promises of God appertaine vnto him. Such a faith is without good workes. But not the faith of the true faithfull seruants of God, by the which they are iustified before God.

ARNOVX.

60. Self.

In Saint Matthew 13. 22. Christ expounding the parable of the sower, saith, He that hath receiued the seed among thornes, is he that beareth the word, but the cares of this world, and the deceitfullnesse of riches choketh the word, and it is made vnfruitfull.

MOVLIN.

It is an abusing of the Reader to alledge places of the Scripture so little to the purpose. This place proueth not, that the true faith of the elect, (which is iustifying faith, whereof our Confession speaketh) can be without good workes.

Of the first and second Iustification, according to the doctrine of the Church of Rome.

ARNOVX.

ARNOUX.

In the same Article somewhat lower. Neuerthelesse we confesse 61. Sect.
that the good workes which we do by the guidance of his Spirit, are
not brought into an account to iustifie vs, or to merite that God
should esteeme vs for his children. If they vnderstand that no man
can merite his first iustification, that is true, and in that sence we are
freely iustified.

MOVLIN.

The holy Scripture speaketh but of one iustification by the which a sinner is iustified before God, which iustification is the absolution of a sinner by vertue of the death of Iesus Christ, & by the imputation of his righteousness. The Church of Rome, which by iustification vnderstandeth regeneration or sanctification, may not onely make two iustifications, but and hundred also, if they will take the degrees of our proceedings in our regeneration for so many iustifications.

In the meane time it is good to know in what sence *M. Arnoux* confesseth that we are freely iustified. The holy Scripture attributeth the remission of sinnes to the mercie of God, and to the redemption in Iesus Christ; but for sanctification, or regeneration, it is an effect of the holy Spirit, which for that cause is called the spirit of sanctification. Therefore when the Apostle, Rom. 5. 9, saith, that we are iustified by the blood of Iesus Christ, and 3. 23. that we are freely iustified, it is clearer then the day light, that by iustifying he vnderstandeth absolution, and not regenerating. These words of free regenerating sound not currantly: but to say that God freely pardoneth vs, is to speake according to reason, and agreeable to the holy Scripture. Colos. 2. 13. *He hath freely pardoned vs all our offences.* But the Church of Rome, which peruerteth all the Scripture, by iustifying freely, vnderstandeth freely to regenerate. And thereby maketh two regenerations, whereof the first is freely, and the other not freely, but merited, as if God gaue vs some graces not freely, nor of his meere liberalitie.

Of Merits.

ARNOVE.

62. Sect.

But they pretend, that workes done by the grace of the holy Spirit, are not meritorious; as if the holy Spirit were not able to worke in vs, and by vs, and with vs, such things as are worthy of himselfe.

MOVLIN.

Our aduersaries will haue workes done by grace and the aide of the holy Ghost, to be meritorious. This is a bold assertion. For there is not any man in France, what seruice soeuer he hath done for the king, that dares presume to say to the king, that he hath deserued to be made rich by the king. And which is more, if we merit eternall life, God should be vnjust if he giues it not vnto vs; for it is iniustice to withhold a seruants wages from him which he hath deserued. By this meanes we are in a good case, and need do no more but to aske payment of God, if he will not be vnjust. Then seeing it is so, it shall not be amisse to examine these merits, and to know the value and possibilitie of them.

In this point the Masse and the Councell of Trent are at variance. For in the Canon of the Masse which is said every day, the Priest maketh this prayer: *Receiue vs into the fellowship of thy Saints,* ^a not weighing our merits, but granting vs pardon by Iesu Christ our Lord. But the Councell of Trent in the sixth Session hath ordained otherwise, ^b defining, that the good workes of a righteous man are in such manner gifts of God, as that they are also our merits; and that a man by the grace of God, may not onely merite eternall life, but also an augmentation of glory, that is, a degree of blessednesse in heauen more then ordinary. The opinion of *Thomas* is, ^c that our good workes for so much as they proceed from the holy Spirit, condignely or worthily merite, that is, by equalitie in value. But that the same merits for so much as they proceed from our owne free will, onely merite by congruities, and by right of well becomming or correspondence, but not in rigor of iustice.

But

^a Non est affirmator meriti sed remia largitur.

^b Si quis dixerit hominis iustificati bona opera ita esse dona Dei vt non sint etiam bona ipsius iustificati merita, &c.

Anathema sit. ^c Thomas 1. par. 2. Quæst. 14. art. 3.

But now adaves merits are higher aduanced. Cardinall Bellarmine which wrote in Rome with a generall approbation, and is commonly followed, in his fifth booke of Iustification, chap. 7. saith, ^d that it is more honorable to obtaine a thing by a mans owne desert, then to haue it by the onely gift of God. And in the fourteenth Chapter he saith, ^e That God will wholly equalize the worke and the reward, so the end that no man should haue lesse recompence then he deserveth, to iudge rightly, which is commutative iustice. This iustice is that which giues one for another, or so much for so much. And after he hath gone about in the seuenteenth chapter, to proue that good workes *etiam sine pacto*, that is, without the promise of God, haue a proportion with life eternall, he concludeth his proposition by a doctrine, which he saith is the common doctrine of Diuines, which is, that the ^f good workes of the righteous merite eternall life by condignity or worthinesse, not onely in consideration of the promise and the acceptation, but also in consideration of the worke, in such sort, that in good workes proceeding from grace, there is a proportion and equalitie to the price of eternall life. From whence he inferreth in the eighteenth chapter, ^g That God is become debtor vnto vs, not onely because of his promise, but also because of our workes. So that we may say, that this Prelate is ready with Counters in his hand, to reckon with God, and to shew him how much he is in arrearages.

The beleefe of our Church is contrary to that. We say, that good workes are necessarie to saluation, not as causes of saluation, but as the way to attaine thereunto; *via regni non causaregnandi*. Good workes serue to glorifie God, to edifie our neighbour, by exercise thereof to strengthen faith, to leade vs to saluation: but they are not the price of the obtaining of saluation, which is sufficiently gotten for vs by the free redemption obtained by Iesus Christ.

It is sufficient to possesse or enioy the kingdome of God, as children of God, and by the title of Heires, and to receiue it of free gift, without boasting to possesse it by the title of buyers or purchasers thereof by our owne merits. Seeing

^d *Magis honorificū est habere aliquid ex merito quā ex sola donatione.*

^e *Deus constituet absolutam aequalitatem inter opera & mercedem, ut nūquid quisque non minorem habens mercedem quā in istis iudiciis meretur, quā est iustitia commutativa.*

^f *17. S. Iam vero opera bona iustorum meritoria esse vita eterna, non saluatione pacti & acceptationis, sed etiam ratione operis,*

ita ut in opera bona, et gratia procedente, sit quaedam proportio & aequalitas ad premium patet eterna.

^g *Non ex sola promissione, sed etiam ex opere nostro Deus efficitur debitor,*

M

that



that we haue in our hands a price of infinite value, whereby the kingdome of God is obtained for vs, that is, the merite of our Lord Iesus Christ, what neede haue we to buy that with our owne merites, which Iesus Christ hath bought for vs, and which God of his meeke liberalitie giueth vnto vs?

2 The holy Scripture pricketh this swelling pride, and wholly bereaueth man of this confidence and trust in his merites: For it calleth saluation a gift of God, and not a purchase by our merites, Ephel. 2. 22. *For the wages of sin is death, but the gift of God is eternal life.* Rom. 6. 23. Vpon which place Saint *Augustine* saith thus: *Here as the Apostle might truly haue said, That the wages of righteousness is life eternall; he chose rather to say, That the grace of God is life eternall; that thereby we should vnderstand, that God leadeth vs to life eternall by his merites, and not by our merites.*

3 The same Apostle, 2. Tim. 1. 9. saith, *He hath saved vs, and called vs with an holy calling, not according to our workes, but according to his owne purpose and grace, which was giuen vnto vs through Iesus Christ before the world was.* Note these words, *He hath saved vs*, to confute *M. Arnoux* glosse, who onely confesseth, that the first iustification, that is, the beginning of regeneration, proceedeth not from our merites, but touching saluation he saith that we merit it. Cleane contrary to the Apostle, who denieth that we are saved by our workes.

4 Therefore, when question is made, to know by what meanes we obtaine eternall saluation, the same Apostle opposeth the grace of God against workes, as things disagreeing, Rom. 4. 4. *To him that worketh the wages is not counted by fauour, but by debt.* You may well say he speakes to our Adversaries, saying: To you which put your trust in your workes, the reward of life eternall must not be reputed for a free gift of God, but for a thing due to you: as before we haue heard *Bellarmino* boast that God is debtor vnto vs. And you must note, that the Apostle speaks of *Abraham* at such time as he beleued in God, and that faith was impured vnto him for righteousness: to the end that no man should thinke or con-

ceit

ceiue that he spake of vntogenerated persons, or of workes that are done by naturall force.

5 The same Apostle, Romans 11. 6. saith; *If it be of grace, it is no more of workes, or else grace were no more grace: But if it be of workes, it is no more grace, or else workes were no more workes.* Then to obtaine eternall life by the grace of God, and to obtaine it by our workes, are things contrarie. The merits of our aduersaries are they not workes? And if they obtaine saluation by their merits, saluation is no more a grace of God. Some of them excuse themselves and say, that we merite by the ayde and help of the grace of God; and that our merits are not acceptable, vnlesse they be died with the blood of Iesus Christ, and that Iesus Christs merits make ours auailable.

6 Whereby they get nothing, for seeing that the grace of God excludes mans merits; how shall we merite by his grace? Did Iesus Christ merite that I might merite, seeing it is the merite of Iesus Christ which makes my merites superfluous? for he merited exprecly to the end that we should no more be bound to obtaine saluation by our merits. The Apostle to exclude the merits of workes, propoundeth the grace of God, saying; *If it be by grace, it is not by workes.* Then how will they haue vs to merite by grace? To merite by grace, is a thing as much disagreeing, as for a man to freese with heate, or to be wet with drinesse. For grace persupposeth a gift, and to merite is a kinde of buyings; so to merite by grace, is to buy by meere gift, which is a ridiculous conceit.

7 To conclude; God giueth no man grace so derogate or disparage his grace, nor vertue to obtaine by merites a thing already fully gotten by the merite of Iesus Christ. As for this imaginarie dying with the blood of Christ, I say that Iesus Christ doth not die our workes with so high a colour. Let vs rather learne to disburthen our soules of pride, then to stuffe this shapelesse idole, invented by men; besides, yea contrary to the word of God.

8 The example of yong children that die shortly after they are baptized, is most cleare and manifest for this purpose. For our Aduersaries grant that those children possesse life e-

small without merites, by vertue of the free adoption in Iesus Christ. Now there are not diuerse meanes of saluation according to the diuersitie of persons, in such manner that one should be saued without merites, and another by his merites.

9. Free election is an inuincible prooffe against merites. The Scripture speaketh of men elected, predestinated, and preordained to eternall life, Ephesians 1. 4. 5. Romans 8. 9. Acts 13. 48. and saith, that this election is free. *Paul calleth it, The election of grace, Romans 11. 5. 6.* Now to shew how it is by grace, he expoundeth it, adding that it is not by workes, saying: *Even so there at this present there is a remnant according to the election of grace. And if it be of grace, it is no more of workes.* and 9. 11. 16. *That the purpose of God might remaine according to election, not by workes, but by him that calleth.* And then addeth: *So there it is not in him that willet, nor in him that runneth, but in God that sheweth mercy.* To attaine to this saluation whereunto they are predestinated, God freely giueth them his holy Spirit, which imprinteth faith in them, and frameth their minds to good workes. *Ephes. 1. 4. God hath chosen vs in Iesus Christ before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy.* Philip. 2. 13. *For it is God which worketh in you both the will and the deed, euen of his good pleasure.* John 15. 5. *For without me can ye do nothing.* 2. Cor. 3. 5. *But our sufficiency is of God.* Then if we haue not merited to be elected to saluation, we haue not merited to be saued. If neither the election to saluation; nor the meanes given vs to attaine to this saluation, are not merited, how shall this saluation be merited? To say that God hath freely predestinated vs to merite saluation, it is to contradict our selues. For it is as much as to say that God freely predestineth vs to be saued, but not freely. If a man should freely giue me an house or an inheritance two hundred miles from hence, vpon condition to go thither to take possession thereof, and conducteth me on the way, nourisheth me, releueth me when I fall, setteth me in the way when I go wrong, giueth me strength to go vntill such time as he putteth me in possession: can I say that I haue gotten.

gotten this inheritance by my merits? shall my steps be the price of the acquisition or getting thereof? This giuer is God, those to whom it is giuen are the Elect, the inheritance giuen is the kingdome of heauen; the way to attaine thereunto, are the comandements of God: euery good worke is a step in this way. In which way if we stumble, or go wrong, God vp-holdeth vs and sets vs in the way againe, & giueth vs strength to go forward: and being at the end of our iourney shall we be so brutish to presume to reckon our steps for merits? yea and for merits of condignitie or equiuallence, and to thinke that God is debter vnto vs? But what can the creator owe to the creature? or what can he owe vnto vs, vnto whom we owe our selues?

10 Those that are of opinion that God hath elected this or that man, not because or in consideration of his good works, but because he foresaw that they should beleue in Iesus Christ, fall into the like inconuenience, because they speake of faith as of a kind of worke, and of a vertue in the faithfull, which they make to precede the election of God. And I see no reason why they will not haue good workes also a condition which precedes the election of God, seeing that God eleceth none but those that shall do good workes, and that good workes are as necessary to saluation as faith is. Then we must say, that God hath freely elected those whom it pleased him, and that to them freely and without merit he giueth his holy Spirit, which in their hearts imprinteth a liuely faith working by charitie.

11 If we would comprehend what this word *merit* importeth, the difficulty would soone be decided. There are fixe things required to merit.

1 The worke that is done must not be a worke that is due to be done, for it is no merit for a man to pay his debts.

2 We must offer that which is our owne. For to present any thing to the king that belongs vnto him, that is no merit.

3 The worke that a man doth to merit of any man, must be fit for his vse and purpose. For a man cannot merit of any man by a worke that shall be vnprofitable for him.

4 The worke that we do to merit withall, must not be defective, and wherein there is any thing to be pardoned.

5 There must be some proportion also betweene the worke and the reward that a man will merit by the worke.

6 Lastly, the thing that we desire to obtaine by meritorious workes, must not be already obtained by another former means: for to seeke of a proprietary or possessor to be a purchaser, it is to dismisse or let go the proprietie. By these five reasons following the word of God teacheth vs that we cannot merit of God.

1 First, all the good that we do, is a thing due, as Iesus Christ saith, Luke 17. 10. *When you haue done all those things which are commanded you, say, we are unprofitable seruants, we haue done that which was our dutie to do.*

2 All the good that we do comes from God, and by consequence cannot merit at Gods hands. 2. Cor. 3. 5. *Not that we are sufficient of our selues to thinke any thing as of our selues, but our sufficiency is of God.* Phil. 2. 13. *For it is God which worketh in you both the will and the deed, euen of his good pleasure.* He crowneth his owne gifts, and repayeth not our merits.

3 Our workes are no profit vnto him. Psal. 16. 2. *My goodnesse extendeth not to thee.* It is true that they are pleasing vnto God, for God loueth that which he doth, but yet they are not meritorious. For if they merited, it should be God that should merit, and not man. The *Mother Teresa*, translated by *Monsieur de Bernille*, which nameth himselfe the Confessor of the blessed, saith with a good grace, that *the seruants of God haue taken so much paines to aide our Lord.* cap. 3. fol. 11.

4 Moreouer, our good workes are imperfect, and there is alwaies some defe& in them. Rom. 7. *The Spirit strineth against the flesh.* Galat. 5. 18. So that we alwayes ought to grow in grace, and alwayes haue need to aske pardon. The loue of a thing is according to the knowledge that a man hath thereof: now here we know but in part and obscurely, as *S. Paul* 1. Cor. 13. 9. 12. saith: therefore now we loue but in part and imperfectly.

5 If we compare the worke with the reward which we pretend to merit, what comparison is there betweene imperfect workes, and which in a moment passe away, and an eternall and celesticall kingdome? Martyrdome is one of the most excellent workes, notwithstanding the Apostle Rom. 8. 18. saith; *I count that the afflictions of this present time, are not worthy of the glorie which shall be shewed vnto vs.* 2. Cor. 4. 17. *Our light affliction which is but for a moment, causeth vnto vs a farre more excellent and an eternall weight of glory.*

6 Lastly, how can we by our merits obtaine eternall life, which is already obtained for vs by our redemption in Iesus Christ, and which appertaineth vnto vs, in as much as we are children of God, adopted in Iesus Christ? Galat. 4. 7. *If thou art a sonne, thou art also an heire through Christ,* Rom. 8. 17. *If we be children, we are also heires, euen the heires of God, and heires annexed with Christ.* Whereupon also the kingdome of God is not called a purchase by our workes, but an inheritance, Ephes. 1. 14. 18. Whosoever pretendeth by his merits to purchase the inheritance that he hath from his father, casteth off childlike affections, and renounceth his succession, and of a sonne and heire, becomes mercenary and a purchaser, and in conclusion goeth about to pay God with coyne ouerlight.

12 For this also is one of the great diseases of the Church of Rome, who not contenting her selfe to gaine Paradise by her merits, brings in diuers other workes for merits which are none, and which not onely do not merit a reward, but rather deserue punishment: as to pray without vnderstanding what they say: to fast for another man: to kisse holy graines: to say their Pater-noster and Aue Marie by tale vpon a paire of beades: to go to the Iubilie: to worship relickes: to run on pilgrimage into Spaine, leauing their houses, worke and families: to make garments to put vpon images: to take from their poore children to giue to rich Monks, &c. These are the works for which God is indebted vnto men, and is in arrearages vnto them. Now if good workes become euill when they are done in pride, as thereby to bind God to men,

How much lesse are euill works meritorious to saluation, and all this trash of humane inuentions which they present vnto God for merits? For our aduersaries thinke that they haue reason to presume, that God is not withthankfull vnto those that do good vnto him.

The effects of this doctrine of pride are sufficient to overthrow it. For these men that are so laden with merits, say, that they know not whether they shall be saued or not, and die in feare and disquietnesse of conscience. It is (say they) a kind of rashnesse to assure our selues of our saluation. This distrust is most iust; this doubt of theirs is well grounded, seeing that the trust of our merits is without ground. For who knoweth the value or worth of euery merit? Who knowes for how much euery peece of this money goes turrant in Paradise? Who knowes when he hath done merits enough? Therefore the deuouetest men buy other mens merits, and (as the Priest doth in the Masse) aske saluation of God for the merits of the Saints.

From this trust that any man hath of his merits, there springeth a most euident consequence, that is, that whereas according to the Scripture, faith produceth good workes, here on the contrary, workes produce faith, and are the foundation of the hope of saluation. That which *M. Arnone* thrusteth in by the way touching workes of supet erogation, shall be hereafter examined apart.

ARNOVX.

63. *Soll.*

Places of the Scripture quoted in the margent of the Confession.
Psal. 16. 2. *O my soule thou hast said vnto the Lord, Thou art my Lord: my goodnesse extendeth not vnto thee.*

It is very true, that our workes serue for nothing vnto God, and that he hath no need of them: but doth it therefore follow, that being conformable to his Law, and done by his holy Spirit, that they are not pleasing vnto him, and worthy of his commendation, that is to say, meritorious?

MOVLIN.

They are pleasing vnto him, and worthy of commendation,

tion, but not meritorious.

ARNOVV.

Luke 17. 10. So likewise ye, when ye haue done all those things which are commanded you, say, We are vnprofitable seruants; we haue done that which was our dutie to do. 64. *Sell.*

This place makes nothing for them, as I haue shewed in the Article.

MOVLIN.

But on the contrary it is euident and manifest against merits, because they are vnprofitable to God; and you haue said nothing against it, but onely that you said, that they that do more then they are bound to do, are no vnprofitable seruants; which is another abuse worse then the first, whereof I will speake hereafter.

ARNOVV.

Rom. 4. 1. What shall we say then that Abraham our father hath found concerning the flesh? For if Abraham was iustified by workes, he hath wherein to reioyce, but not with God. 65. *Sell.*

Abraham by workes voyde of faith, (whether they were morall or ceremoniall) could not be iustified; nor haue any glory but before men; and faith onely without workes did not iustifie him, saith Saint Iames. But faith ioyned with workes got him true glorie, and iustified him before God.

MOVLIN.

It is false that Saint Paul, Rom. 4. 1. said, that Abraham was not iustified by the workes of the ceremoniall Law, whereof Saint Paul had not yet spoken in all the precedent Chapters, and which was not a law in Abrahams time.

It is false also that Saint Paul said, that Abraham was not iustified by morall workes without faith. For he speakes expressly of the workes that Abraham did hauing faith, then when Moses saith of him, Abraham beleued, and it was imputed vnto him for righteousness, Gen. 15. 6. He beleued then, and yet it was from that time that Saint Paul saith, that his faith

was

The Buckler of the Faith.

was imputed vnto him for righteousness: Which is confirmed by the example of *Dauid*, added to that of *Abraham*, who also established righteousness without workes, when he wrote the 33 Psalm, wherein he placeth all the blessednesse of man in the remission of sinnes: at which time *Dauid* was regenerated and iustified. It was of morall workes, and done by him in the time of his Apostleship, that *Saint Paul* spake, 1. Cor. 4. 4. saying, *For I know nothing by my selfe: and headeth thereunto, yet am I not thereby iustificied.*

66. Sect.

ARNOVX.

He hath saied vs, not by the workes of righteousness which we had done, but according to the washing of regeneration and renewing of the holy Spirit. Tit. 3. 5.

That is true, that our workes without the sacraments of Baptisme and of Penance which renew vs, cannot saue vs. Those Sacraments are necessary, either done in vow or in act, but what serues that for the article?

MOVLIN.

M. Arnoux
falsification.

You falsifie this place of Scripture. This is the truth of it. *He saued vs, not by the workes of righteousness which we had done, but according to his mercie, by the washing of the new birth, and the renewing of the holy Spirit: You haue left out these words, but according to his mercie: which excludes merits.* If by the word regeneration *Saint Paul* vnderstandeth baptism, or interior satisfaction, it is another question. But to the purpose, is not this place expressly against merits, seeing he saith, that God hath not saued vs by our workes? Touching that which *M. Arnoux* addeth, that Baptisme and the Sacrament of Penance are necessarie either by vow or in act, it shall be examined hereafter. By the way let the Reader marke, that *M. Arnoux* esteemeth not Baptisme to be necessarie to saluation, seeing that a vow is sufficient; and that he holdeth that a man may be saued without doing actuall Penance, for he holdeth that it is sufficient that a man hath an intent to do it.

ARNOVX.

ARNOUX.

*Contrary places of Scripture. James 2. 21. Was not Abraham 67. Self.
our father iustified through workes, when he offered Isaac his sonne
upon the altar?*

*Do you not see, that man is iustified by workes, and not by faith
only?*

MOVLIN.

It is true, before men: but not before God, as the Apostle
Rom. 4. 2. saith, *For if Abraham were iustified by workes, he hath
wherein to reioyce, but not with God.* But seeing that our aduer-
saries take the word *iustification* for *regeneration*, it is in vaine
for them to obiekt this place against vs; for we know that
man is nor regenerated onely by faith. Charitie, and other
Christian vertues, are also a part of regeneration.

*Whether God is debter vnto vs. And touching
the reward.*

ARNOUX.

*Heb. 6. 10. For God is not vnrighteous, that he should forget 68. Self.
your workes. And therefore if he should forget it, he should be vn-
iust, and be cannot be vnjust in this case but in refusing that which
he oweth.*

MOVLIN.

These words are horrible. If God should denie life eter-
nall to *M. Arnoux*, he should denie him that which he oweth
him, and God should be an ill payer of his debts. It may be
he is afraid that he will play bankrupt, for how should he
pay so many debts? The mischief is, that the Iesuite hath no
meanes to constraîne him, nor to summon him. Let this
Doctor learne, that God is iust in rewarding our good
workes, not because our workes deserue it, but because Gods
promise is such. It is a iust thing to accomplish a promise.
A man may promise one a thing that he hath not yet defer-
ued. A man may reward one that hath not deserved a re-
ward.

ward. For there are full rewards which are giuen in consideration of the person & not for the merite of the worke. As a father giueth a new coate to his sonne as a reward for making of a line with a shaking hand. He would not reward another in that manner which should haue done an hundred times as much. That which in Matthew 5. 36. is called a reward, in Luke 6. 32, is called grace, *gratia*. And the penny giuen to the workemen that came at the last houre, is called a reward: although much about their desert, Math. 20. Saint Ambrose writeth expressly vpon this place, in the first Epistle of his first booke: *There is (saith he) a kind of reward which is giuen of liberalitie and of grace, and another which is the wages of vertue, and the recompence of a mans labour.*

Alia est merces liberalitatis & gratia, alia virtutis spondium, la-boris remuneratio.

69. Sect.

ARNOUX.

If they did not reiect Ecclesiasticus, I would intreat them to consider of the sixteenth Chapter, verse 14. Make way for euery worke of mercy, for euery man shall finde according to the merits of his workes, and according to the vnderstanding of his pilgrimage. And the 3. 15. of Wisdome: He found them worthy for himselfe. Dignitie and merite are all one thing.

MOVLIN.

This place of Ecclesiasticus is horribly falsified. This word of merite is not found therein. In the Greeke which is the originall, there is, *Euery man shall finde according to his workes*, and not according to the merite of his workes. This falsification is very remarkable.

Touching the place of the third of Wisdome, *He found them worthy of himselfe*, M. Arnoux sheweth how little he is acquainted with the Scriptures: for in stead of producing places out of the Canonically bookes where oftentimes the faithfull are called worthy, he brings vs a place out of the Apocrypha, and which is not in the Hebrew Bible. But to conclude, I say, that if any man be worthy of saluation, it is God that makes him worthy, and not his merits. Dignitie is no merite before God, seeing that dignitie comes from God. And I say

M. Arnoux falsification.

Interpreto autem non dicitur meritis sed operibus.

Reuel. 3. 4.

Luc. 20. 35.

Luc. 10. 7.

say, that if mans dignitie came from man him selfe; and from his owne strength, yet there should be no merit before God; who cannot be bound to his creature, and to whom our good works bring no profit. Much lesse can there be any merite towards God; seeing that all the dignitie in man proceedeth from his liberalitie; and what dignity soever is in him; it is mixed with much imperfection.

Whereas the Scripture saith, that God will reward men according to their workes, as Saint Paul 2. Corinthians 5. 10. *alind reddo: re secundum opera, alind proper opera, alind agere de causa salutis, alind de qualitate eorum quibus datur.* saith, That every man may receive the things done in his body, according to that which he hath done; whether it be good or euill: Pope Gregorie the first, vpon the seventh Psalm of mercie; noteth very well, That it is one thing to render to every one according to his workes; and another to render vnto them for their workes. It is one thing to speake of the cause of saluation; and another to speake of the qualitie of those to whom it is giuen.

Of workes of Supererogation.

ARONVL.

We confesse that we are unprofitable seruants, in this, that whosoever obserueth the commandment, without doing any more then he is bound to do, shall haue no other recompence then that which followeth the obseruation of the commandment, and shall be esteemed unprofitable; as touching the receluing of the fulnesse of recompence that followeth those that do something more then that wherunto they are bound.

MOVLII.

It is not enough to seeke to merit life eternall by workes, as our Aduersaries say; for *M. Aronv.* will perswade vs, that there are some which merit more then life eternall, and a degree of glorie in heauen above the ordinary sort of men. *M. Aronv.* saith; that those that obserue the Commandments of God, and do no more then that wherunto they

are bound, shall have no other recompence then that which followeth the obseruation of the commandment, that is to say, that all their recompence shall be life eternall, which is promised to those that accomplish the commandments of God. Those that haue no other perfection but onely that they haue perfectly obeyed God, are vnprofitable seruants, and incapable of a greater glory: therefore they must be content with eternall life, without pretending to haue more. But there are some that do more then God will haue them to do: and (as *Mr. Arnaud* saith) that do something more then that which they are bound to do: those shall haue the full accomplishing of the recompence; and a glorie aboue the common sort. This is a new Gospel, drawne out of the vwritten word. This is a doctrine full of courage, which esteemeth it a small thing to fulfill the Law of God, and studieth for another perfection, for seate to be an vnprofitable seruant. This surplusage which is done ouer and aboue that whereunto a man is bound, is that which they call Counsels of perfection, and workes of Supererogation, perfecter, and more excellent then all that which God commandeth in his Law, and more then to loue God with all his heart, and his neighbour as himselfe. Such is perpetuall virginity, martyrdome, and distribution of all that a man hath vnto the poore, monasticall vower of obedience, pauerie, and chastitie. Of those that do these supererogatorie workes, *Cardinall Bellarmine* in the thirteenth Chapter of the booke of Monkes, saith: *That they loue God more then they are bound to do.* Those (following *Bellarmino*) *Mr. Arnaud* saith, are not vnprofitable seruants. But he tells vs not to whom they are profitable: for it is necessarie that they should be profitable, either to God, to themselves, or to their neighbours. To God they are not, for he hath no need of our service. Then they must either be profitable to themselves or to their neighbours. Then how are they who by their merites obtaine nothing but life eternall called vnprofitable seruants, seeing that *Mr. Arnaud* will not deny but that they profite themselves, and do the like to their neighbours.

*Quicquid
addam alteri
gradum plus
quam tenor
atque comodo
facio altum
supererogatio-
nis & consilij.*

We on the contrary, acknowledge our selues to be so farre off from being able to do more then that which God commandeth; that we are farre from being able to do that which he commandeth; and putting all our hope and confidence in the mercie of God, seeke not after a degree of glorie about the ordinarie sort of the elect: in what degree of glorie soeuer we be, it sufficeth vs, so we may be with our Sauour, and see the face of our God. In the meane time we reiect not the counsels which are found in the Scripture. It is wise counsell to abstaine from lawfull things, that a man may the easier accustome himselfe to leaue vnlawfull things. It is wise counsell to abstaine from meates which God permitteth to eate, when a weake conscience may be troubled there by. It is wise counsell to a Minister of the Church, not to take any reward, when he can make shift without it, or when the aduersaries take occasion thereby to make his preaching suspicious. It is wise counsell to a man that is continent not to marrie, to the end that he may not be diuerted by domesticall cares, and so beare persecution the easier. But we call these counsels, counsels of Christian wisdom, and not of perfection; the obseruation whereof is not meritorious, nor supererogatorie, but a thing much lesse then the accomplishment of the Law.

Our reasons against these counsels of perfection or works of supererogation are these:

1. God in his Law commandeth vs to loue and to serue him with all our hearts, and with all our strength. And a man can do no more then his strength will permit him to do. *Bellarmino* will, in effect, haue vs by this word *all*, to vnderstand part. So that when the Scripture saith a thing is *white*, we must vnderstand *blacke*. If such interpretations be permitted, what euident testimony would be found in the word of God?

2. The Apostle Saint Paul to the Philippians, chapter 4. 8. commandeth vs *To thinke on those things that are iust, pure, commendable, and honest*. If workes of supererogation be iust and pure, they are commanded by the Apostle, and so are not supererogatorie: If they be not iust nor pure, we must not obserue them.

Lib. de Mat.
nachin cap. 13.

3 If a man cannot accomplish the Law, much lesse then can he do more then the Law commands. Iam. 3. 2. *For in many things we sinne all.* 1. King. 8. 46. *For there is no man that sinneth not.* Psal. 116. 11. *All men are liars.* All the Apostles daily said, *Forgive vs our offences.* Noah, Abraham, David, Job, Saint Peter, and the most excellent servants of God, sinned. Job is called iust & perfect, and yet cursed the day of his birth. It is said of Zacharias and Elizabeth, Luke 1. 6. *that they were iust before God; and walked in all the commandments and ordinances of the Lord, without reproofe.* But these words, *without reproofe*, must be expounded, that they walked in such sort in the commandments of God, that no man could reprove them in any thing: notwithstanding it appeares that Zacharias was a sinner; for that not long after he was punished, because he did not beleeue the word of God declared vnto him by the Angell. Then how can we present vnto God more then he asketh, seeing we cannot giue him that which is his due? How can we do superabundant works, if we be wanting in necessarie works?

4 The perfection of Angels, Psal. 103. 20. it is said to consist in executing the commandment of God. Iesus Christ himselfe saith, that he came to do the will of him that sent him, Ioh. 6. 38. and Heb. 10. 7. These Doctores doing more then the will of God, surpasse the Angels and Iesus Christ himselfe, who could haue attained to monasticall perfection, if he had thought vpon or remembered to haue done workes of supererogation.

5 I would also know of our Adversaries, that do more then God will haue them to do, and that by consequence exceed the commandment of God, if in doing those workes of supererogation they do the will of God, or their owne. If they do the will of God, then they do no worke of supererogation, but a necessarie worke. If they do their owne will, how dare they say that their will is perfecter then the will of God?

6 If to do these superabundant workes, God giueth them his Spirit and his assistance, then necessarily they are bound to do them, lest they should make the grace of God of no effect.

fect. And so they should no more be workes of supererogation, because they are bound to do them.

7 But is not this to wrong the Law of God, which is the rule of righteousness, and to accuse it of imperfection; to go about to do perfecter workes then those which the Law commandeth? The righteousness of the Law is poore and miserable if sinners can exceed it. If there be rules of perfection about the Law, what followeth, but that the Law is an imperfect rule?

8 But is not this an intollerable pride, to make Monkes profitable seruants of God, and *Abraham, Jacob*, and *David* vnprofitable seruants, because they did none of those workes of supererogation?

9 I am afraid that he which intrudes himselfe to do more seruice vnto God then he will haue him do, in the end will find himselfe ill paid for his seruice. For, who required that at his hands? where do we find in the word of God the institution of Monkes, and of monasticall vowes?

10 Compare these superabundant workes with those which God commands, and you shall find much enequality in them. For the loue of God commanded in the Law is alwayes good and necessary: but the vow of single life is euill for those that haue not the gift of continencie. 1. Corint. 7.9. *For it is better to marry then to burne.* To giue all our goods to the poore, is oftentimes a great sinne, if by that meanes we bereaue our children of them, deceiue our creditors, and disinherit our right heires. Pietie doth not ouerthrow nature. 1. Tim. 5. 8. *He is worse then an Infidell that hath not a care of his familie.* Is pietie like a frenzie, which maketh a man forget iustice? It may so happen that some men with hypocrisie or ambition will giue all their goods to the poore, as *S. Paul* 1. Cor. 13.3. saith. Adde hereunto, that Monks that make vowes of chastitie, pouertie, and obedience, are by experience conuicted of the contrary. For the vow of chastitie makes them ynchaste, and abstinence from marriage pussheth them forward to adultery. They make a particular vow of pouerty, to be rich in common, and follow a far and idle kinde of begging,

ging in stead of a sober and vigilant labour. They make a vow of obedience to the rule of Saint *Francis*, or Saint *Ignatius*, and dispense with themselves for not obeying the Commandements of God.

11 Touching Martyrdome, there are two sorts, one which God calleth men vnto, the other, whereunto men rashly thrust themselves. God calleth men to martyrdome, when a man cannot saue his life but by renouncing true Religion: Then martyrdome is a worke commanded, and so necessary, that without it, in that case, a man cannot be saved. It is not then a superabundant worke: it is not a counsell, but a commandement. For God in his Law commandeth vs to loue him aboue all things, therefore more then our liues. In this case then, whosoever would saue his life shall lose his soule. He that shall deny Iesus Christ before men, Iesus Christ will deny him before his Father. But if martyrdome be vndertaken rashly, and if a man run into it without being called thereunto, then it is a transgression of the commandement of Iesus Christ, which saith, *Matt. 10. 23. When they persecute you into one citie, flie into another.* And it is against Saint *Pauls* example, who to escape from his enemies, caused himselfe to be let downe in a basket out at a window in *Damascus*. Faith walketh betweene rashnesse and cowardise. In time of need it maketh the faithfull resolute to die, but it is not angry or vnwilling to liue. Withall, in martyrdome there are two things, the dolor and paine of the body, and the constancie and zeale of faith. The dolor of the body is not a vertue, but an exercise of vertue. Firme faith is a vertue commanded by God, and not a perfection beyond the commandement of God.

12 Adde vnto that a demonstratiue prooffe, that is, that a good thing of it selfe is alwayes better then a thing that is not good but because of another thing. So life is better then meate, because meate is made to maintaine life. So it is with the loue of God commanded in the law compared with these works of supererogation. For the loue of God is alwayes holy, good, and necessarie, but to distribute our goods, or to suffer martyrdome, is not good vlesse it be done for the loue

of God. If we ioine these things together; the distribution of our goods to the poore is not good; but becaufe men are moued thereunto for the loue of God. If you separate them, the loue of God alone is good and holy: but the distribution of our goods without the loue of God is a fault, an iniustice, and hypocrisie.

13 The example which our Aduersaries take out of the nineteenth of Saint *Mathew*, makes nothing for this abuse. A presumptuous yong man said, that he had kept Gods Commandements from his youth vpward: to whom Iesus Christ said, verse 21. *If thou wilt be perfect, go sell that thou hast, and giue it to the poore, and thou shalt haue treasure in heauen.* Our Aduersaries say, that Iesus Christ did onely counsell; and not command the yong man to sell all his goods, with a counsell of perfection; and that this treasure in heauen is a glorie aboue the ordinarie glorie of the Saints, promised to those who hauing accomplished the Law, do something more, and follow a greater perfection.

To cleare this, we must know that this yong man abused himselfe and lyed, in boasting that he had accomplished the Law. For Iesus Christ accuseth him of putting his trust in his riches, Marke 10. 14. And in forsaking Iesus Christ, and preferring his goods before Iesus Christ, he manifestly shewed his couetousnesse. He that loueth his riches more then Iesus Christ, doth not loue him with all his heart, and with all his soule, and by consequence hath not accomplished the Law. *Chrysostome* in his 64. Homilie vpon Saint *Mathew* saith, That he was couetous. Saint *Augustine* in his 89. Epistle saith, That yong man answered more arrogantly then truly, that he had obserued the commandements of the Law. *Basil* in his Sermon against Riches speaketh thus to the yong man: *It is euident that thou art farre estranged from this commandement, and that thou giuest false witnesse of thy selfe.* Seeing therefore that this man had not fulfilled the Law, it had bene in vaine for Iesus Christ to counsell him to do more then the Law: it had bene as much as if a man should set vp the weathertocke before the foundation be laid.

*Ad Hilariū
libr. 4. de lin-
quendiū sacul-
tatibus.
cunctis dñi
dñi in talie,
melioris dñi
xpi, n̄ iudicis
cunctis con-
ruptiōis.*

Iesus Christ, that knew his heart was set vpon his riches, gave him that commandement, thereby to discover his auarice, and to checke him for the same. And it is not to be doubted, that refusing to do that which Iesus Christ said vnto him, he had not offended God. In that the Gospell saith, that Iesus Christ loued him, it doth not argue that he was without sinne: for Iesus loued Ierusalem when he wept ouer it, and yet he accused it that it had slaine the Prophets. And dying for sinners, he shewed sufficiently that he loued them. It was then a compassionate loue that he shewed to that man, in whom he acknowledged some commendable indeuour, and some seeds of the feare of God.

THE XXIII. ARTICLE.

We beleue that all the figures of the Law had an end at the comming of Iesus Christ: yet howsoeuer the ceremonies are no more in vse, the substance and truth thereof remaines vnto vs in the person of him in whom all accomplishment consisteth. And besides we must vse the aide of the Law and the Prophets, as well to direct our liues, as to be conformable to the promises of the Gospell.

THE XXIII. ARTICLE.

We beleue, that seeing Iesus Christ is giuen vnto vs for our sole Aduocate, and that he commandeth vs to come with confidence vnto God the Father in his name, and that it is not lawfull for vs to pray but according to that forme which God hath set down vnto

vnto vs in his word, that all that which men haue imagined touching intercession of Saints that are dead, is nothing but an abuse and a deceit of Sathan, to make men erre out of the forme of praying well. We also reiect all other meanes which men presume vpon thereby to redeeme themselves before God, as derogating from the sacrifice of the death and passion of Iesus Christ. Lastly, we hold Purgatory to be an illusion proceeding out of the same shop, from whence also are proceeded monasticall vowes, pilgrimages, prohibition of mariage, and the vse of meates, the ceremoniall obseruation of dayes, auricular Confession, Indulgences, and all other such things whereby men thinke to deserue grace and saluation. Which things we reiect, not onely because of the false opinion of merit which is ioyned vnto them, but also because they are humane inuentions, which impose a yoke vpon mens consciences.

Of Inuocation of Saints.

MOVLIN.

The Sonne of God is the onely Mediator which maketh intercession for vs, and he alone it is who speaking for vs cannot be denied or refused; and he onely, without whose mediation all others can preuaile nothing before God; and he onely that neuer ceaseth to intermedieate for vs, and that by his onely and proper merits. But whither do they runne, which thinke or imagine, that none others but onely the Sonne of God can implore the bounty and mercy of God by the merites of Christ: seeing they agree with vs, that we may obtaine all whatsoeuer we aske for our selues in his Name, and that we shall not be denied for others? 71. Sed.

N 3

MOVLIN.

MOVLIN.

He speaks according to his accustomed manner, which is, neuer to report the truth of our beleefe. We say nothing of all that which he maketh vs to say; we know well that others besides Iesus Chrift may implore the bountie and mercie of God by the merits of Iesus Chrift.

ARNOVX.

72. *Self.* Why sooner, or rather in this life then in the ether, shall we haue this credite?

MOVLIN.

This also makes vs say things farre differing from our beleefe. Our Confession defineth not what we shall do in the life to come, nor whether we shall pray for those that are liuing after vs vpon the earth. That is not our difference. The question is, whether when we shall be in heaven, men that are on earth ought to pray vnto and call vpon vs. It is one thing to enquire or to seeke to know what the Saints do in heaven, and another thing to know what we should do here on earth. But *M. Arnoux* not vnderstanding the question, mixeth those two things together which are much differing one from the other.

ARNOVX.

73. *Self.* Haue the Saints in heauen lesse knowledge of our necessities, or lesse charitie then we?

whether the Saints vnderstand our prayers, and all whatsoeuer is done vpon earth.

MOVLIN.

The Saints that are in heauen haue more charitie then we, and more knowledge of those things which belong or serue

serue to their blessednesse. But it is not necessarie nor conuenient for their blessednesse, that they should haue an exact knowledge of all particular things which are done here vpon earth, nor that they should know euery proesse that is handled in Courts of Law, the troubles and busineses in a Faire, or for how much euery ox is sold in a market. I speake not of many filthy and dishonest things: as also of diuers other things which might trouble their blessednesse: as if a father should see the vices and afflictions of his children, one sent to the gallowes, another vpon a scaffold to be executed, another cast downe into hell, and another kneeling before an Image to pray vnto it.

The holy Scripture makes it euident vnto vs. Salomon in the 9. of Ecclesiastes, 5. 6. saith, *that the dead know not any thing, neither haue they any more a reward.* And a little after, *Neither haue they any more a portion for euer in any thing that is done vnder the Sunne.* And Iob 14. 21. speaking of a father that is dead, saith, *His sonnes come to honour, and he knoweth it not; and they are brought low, but he perceiveth it not.* And 2. Kings. 21. 20. God promiseth king *Iosias* to let him go peaceably downe to his graue, that his eyes should not see the euill which God intended to bring vpon the Iewes.

Again. If the Saints vnderstood our prayers, it is necessary that they should know the imaginations of our hearts, to know whether we pray with a good affection. But the holy Scripture, 2. Chron. 6. 30. saith, *that God onely knowes the hearts of the children of men.* It is to no purpose to say that God onely of himselfe knows the hearts of men, & that the Saints know them by reuelation: for besides that this is to diuine and affirme a thing which is vnknowne vnto vs, and whereof the Scripture speaketh not, in this distinction there is a contradiction. For they giue vs a reason why the Scripture saith, that the Saints know not our hearts, which is, because God hath giuen them vnderstanding to know them: they say, that they know not our thoughts, because God hath made them know them. As if I should say, I haue no money because you gaue me some. By the same reason I may say, that God

onely knowes that Iesus Christ died for vs, because he knoweth it from and by himselfe; but we know it not but by reuelation. He that hath taught a thing to another man, cannot say that he onely knowes it. I confesse that God sometimes reuealed the thoughts and counsels of some men vnto his Prophets; but that knowledge was seldome given vnto the Prophets, and onely in as much as it was necessarie for the execution of their charge. And 2. Kings 4. 47, *Elisens* faith that God had hidden the death of his hostesse the Sunammite sonne from him; how much more the hearts of all men? And by consequence, that cannot be alledged for the Saints that are dead, to whom God hath not given any charge in the Church. For to say that men giue the Saints charges and offices in Paradise, making one the protector of women in childbed, another a Physitian to heale the toothach, another to cure horses, another Patron of a towne or a whole countrie, is a thing no lesse absurd then if the flies should take vp. on them to distribute and giue the charges and offices of the Empire of Rome to whom they would.

And this may serue also for answer to the argument drawne from the example of the Angels, amongst whom the Gospell teacheth vs, there is ioy for the conuersion of a sinner, Luke 15. 10. God hath appointed the Angels to be gardians of the faithfull, Psal. 34. 7. *The Angell of the Lord encampeth round about them that feare him, and delinereth them*; and Heb. 1. 14. *They are ministering spirits, sent forth to minister for their sakes which shall be heires of saluation*. It is no maruell then that God reualeth vnto them the interior repentance of a sinner, and that they reioyce at the effects thereof which appeare outwardly.

To thinke that the Angels and the Saints in the presence of God know all things, or to say with Pope *Gregorie* in the three and thirtieth chapter and fourth booke of his Dialogues, *What know not they there, where they know him which knoweth all things?* is to giue their rash coniectures for lawes, and without the word of God, to speake of that which is done in heauen, as if they came newly from thence: and

*Quid est quod
ibi nesciant,
qui scientem
omnia sciunt?*

and it is contrary to the word of God. For Iesus Christ, Mat. 18. 10. saith, that *The Angels alwayes behold the face of the Father which is in heauen:* and yet they know not when the day of iudgement shall be, Marke 13. 32. By the publication of the Gospel they haue learned things which before they knew not. For Saint *Paul* Ephes. 3. 10. speaking of the publication of the Gospell among the Gentiles, saith, that it was done, *to the intent that the manifold wisdom of God might be made knowne vnto principalities and powers in heauenly places.* Whereupon Saint *Peter* in his first Epistle, 1. 12. saith, that *The Angels desired to see those things;* as desiring to learne them.

Touching Pope *Gregories* words, they may well be borne withall, if he speake of the knowledge that the Saints haue of things belonging to their blessed state. But if he speake of a general knowledge of all things, his words are as full of absurdity, as if one should say, that he which seeth *Philip*, necessarily seeth all that which *Philip* sees. If standing on the ground I see a man vpon the top of a steeple, do I see all that which he seeth? If the sight of him that looketh is to be measured according to the sight of him on whom he looketh, he that sees a blind man shall see nothing at all.

To be short, to affirme that the knowledg of the Saints should be of the like extent that the sight of God is, it is to make the creature infinite. For first, it is necessary that the Saints (in that respect) should know the infinitie of Gods essence, and in a finite spirit should containe an infinite knowledge: and also that in a moment they should know all things: and that Saint *Nicholas* in an instant should see all the thoughts of men, and vnderstand all their prayers. Things which repugne the essence of creatures, whose essence as it consisteth in a currant for a time, so the actions thereof are successiue, and are done one after another, and not all in a moment. The ancient Fathers speake of the state of the Saints, and of the memory of things which they haue seene and knowne in this life, and of the knowledge which they haue had of things here below, sometimes with certaintie,

dead, where he holds for an assured opinion, that if he dead *mortuus, quod*
 knew what is done here, his good mother *Monicha* *us quid agant*
 not haue forgotten him. *neque nescia.*

There are diuers places found in *Chrysostome* wh
 faith, that the Saints do not yet enioy celestiall glory; and o
 thers wherein he faith that they do enioy it. And there
 are some places found in him, wherein he seemeth to appro
 the inuocation of Saints, and others in much greater number
 wherein he condemneth it. Which is a prooffe, that in al
 some places haue bene thrust into the writings of that holy
 man.

Whether Iesus Christ is our onely Mediator and aduocate.

ARNOUX.

Places of the Scripture set downe in the margent of the Confes- 74. Sect.
sion. 1. Tim. 2. 5. For there is one onely God, and one onely mediator
betwene God and man, which is the man Iesus Christ, who gaue
himselfe a ransom for all men.

In this place the word Aduocate is not there, and the word Me-
diator is an equiuocation, for that it may be taken for a mediator
of intercession and for a mediator of redemption. Besides this, the
text in the Ministers Bible is false: for in the Greeke, (which is the
originall,) the word onely is not there.

MOVLIN.

The word *Aduocate* is not in the place of the 1. to Tim. but
 it is found in 1. Ioh. chapter 2. verse 1. *If any man sinne we haue*
an Aduocate with the Father, Iesus Christ the iust. It is from
 thence that our Confession hath taken the word *Aduocate*.
 And if the word were not there, yet by the word *Aduocate*
 we vnderstand nothing but a Mediator, which is the very
 word vsed by Saint *Paul*. Touching that which *Maister*
Arnoux saith, that the word *mediator* is an equiuocation, he
 accuseth Saint *Paul* to haue equiuocated. He saith, that the
 word *mediator* may be taken for a mediator of intercession,

or for a mediator of redemption. But the coupling of these together, *God is one, and the Mediator is one*, confuteth this distinction. For as the Apostle maketh not two sorts of Gods, so he alloweth not of two sorts of mediators towards God. If it be lawfull to make distinctions vpon the word *Mediator*, why not vpon the word *God*, and so to induce diuers Gods? For although we do not denie that the Saints pray for vs, yet they are not called mediators of intercession, because we call him the Mediator of intercession that receiueth our prayers to present them vnto God; which the Saints cannot do, because they vnderstand not our prayers, as we haue already proued.

Adde hereunto, that this distinction maketh the Saints to be but mediators of intercession, contrary to the Church of Rome, which beleeueth that the Saints do not onely mediate for vs, but also pay, merite, and satisfie for vs. Witnesse the doctrine of Indulgences or pardons, by the which the Pope distributeth vnto Christians the superabundance of the satisfactions of the Saints to serue them to obtaine remission of sins before God. Witnesse also the Masse, which asketh saluation of God by the merits of the Saints, as if they had merited for vs. Whereupon *Bellarmine* also in his first booke and fourth chapter of Indulgences, makes no difficulty to say, that *the Saints in some sort are our redeemer*s.

Now for the imputation laid on vs, [to haue falsified this place, and to haue put in our text, one onely God, and one onely Mediator, otherwise then it is in the Greeke, where the word *onely* is not found, this accusation argues, that our aduersarie either hath no vnderstanding in the Greeke, or else that he hath no conscience. According to the Greeke, it is thus, *There is one God, and one Mediator*. Is not that as much to say, as *There is one only God, and one only mediator*? And when we translate, *There is one onely God*, our aduersaries dislike it not; but when in the words following we translate, *There is one onely Mediator*, they accuse vs of falshood; and yet the manner of speaking is all one in the Greeke, and in the same line. The French Bible translated by the Doctors of Louain iustificth vs therein; for in the third chapter of the same

Epistle

*Quorum mer-
itis precibusq;
rogamus, &c.*

*De Deo, sic pu-
er.*

Epistle, verse 2. Where there is *unius uxoris virum*, they have translated *the husband of one only wife*; because that is in Greek, as also *unus* in Latin, is as much as alone, and by consequence only.

The ancient Doctors did not reiect this word *alone* in this matter. ^a *Tertullian* in the thirtieth chapter of his Apologie saith, *We cannot aske these things of any other but of him of whom I know I shall obtaine them. For also it is he onely which granteth it, and I am he who am to be heard, that am his seruant, which call vpon him onely.*

Origen in his eight tome against *Celsus* saith, ^b *We must pray to none but to God onely for all things, and to his onely Sonne.*

Saint Ambrose in his oration vpon the death of *Theodosius*, correcting that which he had said in the booke of Widowes, made when he first began to be a Christian: *Thou neuertheless, O Lord, oughtest onely to be called vpon, and praied vnto.*

As touching making Saints our mediators, *Saint Augustine* in many places is expressly against it: in his two and twentieth Treatise vpon *Saint Iohn*, *That is it which thy Saviour saith, Thou hast no where to go but vnto me, thou canst not go but by me.*

And in his Epistle against *Parmenian* he saith, *If Saint Paul was a mediator, so should all the other Apostles be mediators; and so there should be diuers mediators: and Saint Paul also should haue mistaken himselfe, in saying that there is but one God and one Mediator.* Now ye must note, that in that Chapter he speakes but of a mediator of intercession, for he disputed against *Parmenian*, that had called the Bishop mediator betweene God and men.

And in the first Treatise vpon the first Epistle of *Saint Iohn*, the second Chapter, vpon these words of *Saint Iohn*, *We haue an Advocate with the Father*; he saith thus: *This great person saith not, You haue an Advocate with the Father; but, If any man hath sinned, we haue an Advocate with the Father; he saith not, You haue, nor also, You haue me, nor, You haue Christ.*

ro peccatorum vt haberet aduocatum Christum, quam ponere se pro Christo aduocatum.

bnt

^a Ipse qui solus praestat & ego sum cui impetrare debemus, famulus eius qui eum solum obsecro. ^b Hic est deus dei, non est deus deorum, sed deus dei. ^c Sed tamen tu solus Domine inuocandus es.

^d Non est quod eas nisi ad me, non est quod eas nisi per me. ^e Lib. 2. cap. 8. ^f Nam si esset mediator Paulus, essent relique & ceteri Apostoli, ac sic multi mediatores essent nec ipsi Paulo constaret ratio quia dixerat, unus Deus & unus Mediator.

^g Non dixit habetis, nec me habetis dixit, nec ipsum Christum habetis dixit, sed Christum posuit, non se; & habemus dixit, non habetis. ^h Maluit se ponere in numero

but he hath put Christ, and not himselfe, and hath said, We haue, and not, You haue: he chose rather to put himselfe into the number of sinners, than he might haue Christ for an Advocate, then to put himselfe for an Advocate instead of Christ, and so to be found among the proud and damned crue.

Among ancient writers there are some places found which speake of the intercession of the Saints. There are also wishes found that were made by liuing men, that the Saints would pray for them: but we haue already said, that our difference is not, whether the Saints pray for vs, but whether we must pray vnto and call vpon them. And although that in ancient Writers there are found exaroples of particular persons who by a disordered deuotion called vpon the Saints, yet it is but of late time that the inuocation of Saints is put into the common Seruice, and is established by lawes and rules of Councils.

But alwayes they are such men that speake, in whom our Aduersaries themselves note diuers errors: and therefore their allegation makes rather against then for the inuocation of Saints. Hauing the holy Scripture for vs, it sufficeth vs; wherein our Aduersaries themselves confesse, that the Inuocation of Saints is not commanded: and now they beginne to say, that it is not necessary, contradicting Pope Innocent the third, who in the third booke of the Mysteries of the Masse, chapter 9. saith, That the Suffrages of the Saints are necessary for vs, as long as we are in the way.

ARNOVX.

75. Sect.

Iohn 1. Epistle 2. 1. If any man sinne, we haue an Advocate with the Father, Iesus Christ the iust, and he is the reconciliation for our sinnes.

He saith not, that we haue but one Advocate, he is farre from that. But speaking of the excellencie of the Advocate, without whom all the other are not to be received, he saith, We haue an Advocate, without excluding others.

Council. Carthage. 3. Can. 23. Cum ad alios esse assidue semper ad Patrem dirigatur oratio.

Necessarium nobis est in via sanctorum suffragium.

That

That the Saints are not our Advocates, and that the Church of Rome innocateth diuers Saints that neuer were, and whose holinesse is very questionable.

MOVLIN.

Whosoever knoweth what it is to be an Advocate with God, knoweth also that the same title belongeth not vnto the Saints. He is an Advocate with God for vs, who receiueth our prayers, and presenteth our requests to God, and accompanieth them with his intercession. The Saints vnderstand not our prayers, as we haue already proued, and by consequence cannot present them to God: and though they vnderstood our prayers, God hath receiued them before the Saints haue any leisure to ioyne their recommendations thereto. And in the same place, Saint *John* hauing said that we haue an Advocate with God, addeth, *For it is he which is the reconciliation for our sinnes*: Shewing how he is our Advocate, to wit, because he maketh reconciliation for our sinnes. Then to be an Advocate for sinners, is to be their reconciliator; and if Iesus Christ be our onely reconciliator, then also he is our onely Advocate.

Our Sauour Iesus Christ decideth the question in plaine words, *John* 14. 6. saying, *I am the way, the truth, and the life, no man cometh to the Father but by me*. Then not by the Saints, nor by the intercession of creatures.

If the Saints be advocates in heauen, who hath made them such? who hath receiued them for such? who commanded vs to pray vnto them? Haue children any need to vse intercessors for them to speake vnto their father? And seeing that God frames and inspires our prayers, must we haue intercessors to recommend that prayer vnto God which he himselfe hath put into our hearts and mouthes? If I present my prayer vnto God by the intercession of Iesus Christ onely, shall my prayers:

prayer be lesse acceptable vnto God then if I had employed the Saints to make intercession for me?

If we thoroughly consider of this matter, it will be found that our aduerſaries seeking to go to God by the intercession of the Saints, draw mens spirits into an endlesse labyrinth. For they say they go to God by meanes of the Saints, but in effect they go to the Saints by Gods meanes: for they confesse that God reuealeth our prayers to the Saints. Then they bring in God aduising the Saints, as if he should say to Saint *Francis*, *Blessed Saint, know that such an one that liues below in the earth in such a place, asketh such and such things of thee, whereof I tell thee, to the end that thou shouldst pray vnto me for him, and then I will take aduice whether I will heare thee or not.* Which is an hatching of goodly conceptions, which make God mediator to the Saints, rather then the Saints mediators to God.

Now if by the Saints we go to Iesus Christ, and if they be mediators to the Mediator, the prayers that we shall make to the Saints shall first go to God, and from God to the Saints, and from the Saints to Iesus Christ, and from Iesus Christ to God. A man that is in danger of drowning, may sinke foure times at the least before his prayer shall haue passed through so many hands.

And yet there is some difficultie: for before we make the Saints our mediators, we must be well assured that they are Saints. Now the church of Rome calleth vpon many Saints that neuer liued in the world, and many whose blessednesse may iustly be called in question.

The three Kings, Saint *Longinus* that pierced Christs side: Saint *Martiall* cousin to Saint *Peter* that waited on the table when Iesus Christ celebrated the Eucharist, that draue Pagan religion out of France in the time of the Gothes when there were no Gothes in France: Saint *Vesula* daughter to the King of England (when there was no King in England) captaine of an army of eleuen thousand Virgins: Saint *Katherine* daughter to *Cestus* King of Alexandria when there was no King in Alexandria, who in the Emperour *Maxentius*

time

time, converted *Queene Faustina* and fifty Philosophers, are persons that neuer lined in the world, as we may easily proue, and whose liues (by *Baronius* confession in his booke of Martyrs) are stuffed with a number of fables. The witnesses which they produce for their liues, are *Usuard*, *Simeon Metaphrastus*, *Molanus*, *Euthymius*; the Calendar of the Grecians, and such new fabulous authors, which *Baronius* wholly contradicts. But no good ancient author who liued five hundred yeares after the time which is named wherein they say these imagined Saints should liue, doth speake of them. *Baronius* maketh account that *Saint George* and *Saint Christopher* are symbollicall pictures, in the same sort that we paint the vertues: and yet men call vpon these Saints; and it is found that *Saint George* was an Arian Bishop, enemy to *Athanasius*. The like of *Saint Margarets*, whom the diuell swallowed downe into his belly, and burst therewith, which is a kind of lying in childbed, and therefore they reade her Legend to women lying in childbed. They make these Saints to liue vnder kings that neuer were, and in a time and in a countrey wherein there were no Martyrs, nor the name of Christianitie knowne. They begin to be borne fixe or seuen hundred yeares after they died. There are a thousand absurd and ridiculous actions attributed vnto them. A man should sooner make cleane *Augias* stable, then cleare the liues of these Saints of fabulous tales.

Add to these imagined Saints, the Saints which the Popes canonize, and place in the role of Saints, commanding the Church of Rome to call vpon them, and attribute an holy day vnto them. An innouation whereof there is not one footstep to be found in all antiquity. The cause is pleaded in the Popes Consistory, and sometimes it happeneth that the Saint for whom they pleade loseth his cause; and hath not men that pleade well for him: sometimes he partly wins his cause, and is declared to be blessed, which is a degree to sanctification: insomuch that many Saints are much bound and beholding to the Popes. And the booke of Sacred Ceremonies saith, that sometimes it happeneth that the Pope is constrained to

Lib. 1. Sac.
Cerem. Sect. 6.
cap. 1. Papa
tunc quodam-
modo cogebat-
tur ad canoniz-
sandam quen-
dam contra
suam opinio-
nem, & prop-
terea protesta-
batur.

* Cap. 1 & 2.
de reliquijs &
sanctorum in-
uocatione.

canonize some Saints against his will; and that, for that cause at this day he yet maketh protestation to discharge his conscience. The Popes, Innocent the third, and Alexander the third, forbid calling vpon any Saints without the Popes approbation. But how many Saints are called vpon, of whose holinesse the Pope neuer made declaration, and of whom he neuer heard speaking?

To acknowledge those for Saints with certainty of faith, a man must be of a very light beleefe: seeing that all those which say that the Pope cannot erre in faith, confesse that he may erre in matter of fact, and that he may be deceived. Now the canonization is made at the solicitation of Princes, or of Prelates, or of Commonwealthe, with manifest dealing vnderhand, and dependeth vpon the honesty and vertue of him that is canonized; which is a question which consisteth vpon information, wherein men may vse deceit and false witnesse, because thereon depends the profit and aduantage to some towne or village, by the assembling and repairing of people to visite a new Saint, who presently doth miracles.

Chap. 16. of
the first booke
of the institution.

Touching this matter, Cotton the Iesuite saith, that to doubt that those whom the vicar of Iesvs Christ hath declared to be blessed are not Saints, it is to make a challenge against the booke of life, to oppose against the manifestation of the booke of Predestination, and to belie the booke with seven seales which was opened by the Lambe. Words which he placeth rather to make ostentation of his high conceits, then for any beleefe that he hath of that which he saith. For a man must be a flatterer in the highest degree, to make the Pope beleefe, that the role of his Canonizations is the booke of life, or the booke sealed with seven seales, whereof there is mention Apocalips 5. 1. And it is hardly to be thought, that the Pope should be assured of another mans predestination, seeing he is not assured of his owne: there being so many Popes which our aduersaries themselves say are damned. By this meanes a man registered among the damned, puts whom he will among the Saints.

Experience manifestly sheweth it: for the Popes oftentimes

times put not those into the role of Saints that have most conformed their lives according to the will of God, but those that supported and advanced the Papall Empire, as Thomas of Canterbury, and Anselmus, who suffered not for the defence of any of the Articles of the Christiana faith, but for the inestitures and other rights and temporall profits which the Pope attributed to himsele in England. From this spring it floweth, that those that haue sought to kill and to murder kings, are at this day put into the role of Martyrs. By this meanes Saint Dominicke became a Saint, who for the maintenance of the Papacy caused diuerse thousands of good Christians to be massacred,* preaching the croysado to roote out the true faithfull people, which then were iniuriously termed Albigenfes, in the same manner as we are called Huguenots, because we receiue not, nor allow of any other doctrine then that of Iesus Christ and the Apostles. This is that Saint which Saint Antonius Archbishop of Florence compared with Iesus Christ, and found but very little inequality betweene him and Iesus Christ.

* Antonius
Archiep. Flor.
Parte 3. Tit.
23. in vita Ca-
tharina Se-
nensis. Pater
Dominicus in
aditorium
sumpsit quas-
dam deuotas
personas ze-
lantes pro fide,
qua corporali-
ter illos haro-
ticis gladio
materiali ex-
pugnarent.
76. Sect.

ARNOVX.

Contrary places of Scripture. James 5. 14. Is any sicke among you let him call for the Priests of the Church, and let them pray for him. And 16. Pray one for another, that you may be healed. Colos. 3. 3. We giue all thanks for you vnto God, which is the Father of our Lord Iesus Christ, alwayes praying for you.

Here are diuers aduocates: Then Iesus Christ is not giuen vnto vs for our onely Aduocate: and if praying here on earth one for another, do no way preiudice his office of Aduocate, how and wherefore should the Saints praying in heauen diminish the glory of his intercession? But rather is it not greater, seeing that all their prayers are grounded vpon his meritts?

That the mutual prayers of the liuing, praying one for another, makes nothing for inuocation of Saints that are dead.

MOVLIN. *And* *Mr. Armer* will proue, that the Saints pray for vs in heauen, which is not in controuersie betwene vs. The Saints may pray generally for the Church, without knowing the thoughts and the necessities of particular persons.

But let vs see how he proues it. He produceth three places out of the Scripture, which speak of the prayers which the liuing make one for another. Which is nothing to the purpose. For here the question is not touching the prayers of the liuing, which God hath commanded to be made, & which are made by those which particularly and mutually know our necessities. But the question is here touching the prayers which the Saints that are dead make for the liuing, whose particular necessities they know not, and we know not what commandement God hath giuen them touching the same. Moreover when we recommend our selues to the mutuall prayers of the faithfull one for another, it is a reciprocall dutie among vs, which is not so betwene vs and the Saints.

And withall, when we pray our neighbours to pray for vs, we do no religious seruice vnto them. We kneele not downe before them in the Church. We do not acknowledge them to be the searchers of our hearts. We esteeme them not to be our Patrons or gardians. We light not vp candles before them. We are well assured that they vnderstand vs when we speake vnto them. To be short, the prayer of the liuing one for another hath no affinity with the intercession and calling vpon dead Saints.

If a man should aske whether the liuing praying one for another may be called aduocates with God, I say, that the word of God giues them not that title, to the language or speech whereof it is requisite for vs to be conformable. It giueth that title to Iesus Christ onely, because that to be a mans aduocate, he must exactly know the cause, and the depth of a mans grieffe: & must not only intreate the Iudge for the party, but also debate and defend his parties cause to be iust and well grounded. Now there is none but Iesus Christ to whom this appertaineth. For man praying one for another, do

not well know the ground of their neighbours griefe, because they know not their hearts, nor the nature and greatness of their finnes, nor their repentance. And they cannot argue with God touching our cause, because they haue nothing to satisfie and pay for vs: their prayer for vs is a simple supplication; and not an action of an Aduocate. There is no body but Iesus Christ who pleading our cause can confute the diuels accusations, which is that accuser spoken of in the twelfth of the Revelation, which accuseth vs day and night before God.

Of the credit and reputation of the Saints in heauen.

ARONVX.

In the same Article somewhat lower. All that which men haue 77. Self. imagined of the Saints that are dead, is but an abuse and a deceit of Sathe.

They thinke to make a sacrifice of praise to Iesus Christ, by giuing him credit (as they suppose) by the excluding of all his seruants, which should be hardly welcome into heauen, and but meanely entertained, if they had lost the credit they had vpon earth.

MOVLIN.

The question betweene vs and our aduersaries is twofold; one, whether the Saints know our hearts; the other, whether we must call vpon, and pray vnto them. These two questions *M. Arnonx* toucheth not, but moueth a third which is not in controuersie, to know whether the Saints pray for vs in heauen.

This discourse, although from the purpose, is neuertheless stuffed with pretty conceits. He saith, that the Saints should be hardly welcome into heauen, and but meanely entertained, if they haue lost the credit that they had vpon earth. This diuinitie is delicate, and serueth but for those that are of generous spirits, whereby he placeth Saints in Paradise,

that are not welcome thither. For it is certaine, that there are many Saines in Paradise that are vnknowne to vs; and many that hauing liued holily, haue bene forgotten or else defamed after their deaths. So that it resteth in the power of the liuing, to make a Saint either well or ill entertained in heauen, if men be not carefull to serue them, and do presently forget them. It is maruell then that such a Saint is suffered to enter into Paradise, and that the gate is not shut against him, seeing he can stand God in no stead with his credit on earth. For Saint *Peter* at the gate might aske him, What account art thou of on earth? hast thou any credit in thy countrey? for God hath need of Saints that are of credit among men. What should Saints do in Paradise to whom men burne no tapers on earth? Yet *M. Arnoux* will haue those Saints to enter therein, but to be hardly welcome thither, and to receiue a disgrace at their entring into heauen. Therefore we haue reason to pitie *Abraham*, *Moses*, and *Dauid*, whose credits are exceedingly diminished, in so much that he should be laughed at that should say, Saint *Moses*, or Saint *Abraham*. They passe onely in the prease among the Patriarkes. No man makes any particular prayer vnto them. No man lightes the least waxe candle that is, before *Abraham* the father of the faithfull. They speake of Saint *Geneuefles* and Saint *Antbones* Masses, but not of Saint *Moses*, nor of Saint *Abraham* Masses. And every Saint hath his charge, one of a sicknesse, another of a towne: but *Moses* and *Abraham* neuer receiued any charge or commission from men. This also is iniurious against the Popes. For I see not that *Innocent* the fourth, *Boniface* the eight, nor *Alexander* the sixth, which were great men on earth, keepe their credit after their death. Therefore they are hardly welcome into heauen, and were but meanly entertained there.

Yet *M. Arnoux* should be borne withall, for that by a recreatiue dexteritie he likeneth or compareth the kingdome of heauen to the formes and complements of the Courts of Popes and Kings. From thence it proceedeth that the Papists dreffe God the Father like the Pope. From hence it cometh
than

that father *Gonseri* called Iesus Christ the Dolphin of hea-
uen. And that the Iesuite *Barradius* made that goodly ob-
seruation, after *Anselmus*, who asked of Iesus Christ, Why
he tooke not his mother with him when he ascended vp into
heauen? The answer is, *It may be, Lord, for feare lest thy bea-
uenty Court should be in doubt which of the two they should go to
meete first, whether thee their Lord, or her which is their Lady.*
It was well then aduised of him, to leaue her behind him on
earth. But lest any man of an hard beliefe might doubt that
which is said before, the Iesuite brings forth *Aristotle* to helpe
him.

*Barradius in
Concordiam
Euangelicam.
Tom 1. lib. 6. c.
11. Portassis
Domine, ne
tua celesti-
caria veniret
in dubium cui
potius occurre-
ret, tibi Domi-
no suo, an ipsi
Domina sua.*

Prooue of Inuocation of Saints by Aristotle.

ARNOUX.

These servants of God should be deprived of one part of humane
felicities, which consisteth, (as *Aristotle* noteth in his *Morals*,) in
the care and remembrance which the soules of the dead should haue
of their friends which they leaue vpon the earth.

MOVLIN.

The place in *Aristotle* which he alledgeth is in the first of
his *Ethickes*, 11. chapter: where there is nothing of all that
which *M. Arnoux* makes him say. For in all that chapter, *A-
ristotle* disputeth whether the affaires of the living touch or
concerne their parents and friends dead, whereof he spea-
keth with such vncertainty, that he saith, that it is to be doubted
whether the dead haue any feeling or participation either of
good or euill: and in the end concludeth like a man that had
no sight therein at all, That if the affaires of the living con-
cerne the dead, it is very little, and not of force to alter their
beatitude. This place therefore is falsly alledged. It was ill
aduised of him to take on him to teach vs what the blessed-
nesse and knowledge of the Saints in heauen is, by the con-
iectures of an heathen Philosopher; & much more, to imagine
that a part of the felicitie of the Saints consisteth in hauing a

*ἡ ἀλλοτρίω τῶν
διαπορεύσων
αὐτῶν τοῦ κα-
τακτάμενος αἱ τοῦ
κατακτάμενος αἱ
κατακτάμενος αἱ
κατακτάμενος αἱ
κατακτάμενος αἱ*

*M. Arnoux
falsification.*

remembrance of their friends that they left behind them upon earth. For if the remembrance of their prosperitie and verue augmenteth the blessednesse of the Saints that are in heauen, the remembrance of their aduersities, and of their vices will also diminish their felicitie. Yet this doth not stretch the care and the knowledge of the Saints, but vnto those who they knew here vpon earth, and left behind them liuing in the world, which is a restraining of their knowledge into very streight limits.

ARNOUX.

79. Sect.

Places of Scripture quoted in the margent of the Confession, Acts 10. 25. and 26, where it is said, that Cornelius meeting Peter, Peter lifted him up, saying, Stand vp, for I am a man.

MOVLIN.

A place of
Scripture cut
off in the
middle by
M. Arnoux.

This place is set downe in the margent of our Confession, to confute all the religious seruice and adoration that men giue to creatures: which if *M. Arnoux* had not cited by halues, and had not taken away the words wherein the force of that place consisteth, every man might haue perceiued how fully it was alledged. Thus the text hath it: *As Peter came in, Cornelius met him, and falling downe at his feet, worshipped him, but Peter took him vp saying, For euen I my selfe am a man. M. Arnoux* hath cut off these words, *he fell downe at his feet and worshipped him.* And see here the like falsification.

ARNOUX.

80. Sect.

And Acts 14. 15. Paul and Barnabas said, Men why do ye these things? we also are men subiect to the same condition.

MOVLIN.

A place of
Scripture cut
in the middle
by M. Arnoux.

You omit that which is said a little before, that they of *Lystris* would haue offered sacrifice to *Barnabas* and *Paul*, as if they had bene gods: which the said Apostles would not suffer them to do.

ARNOUX

ARNOVX.

And *Apocalips 19. 10.* And I fell before his feet to worship him, 81. Sect.
but he said to me, See thou do it not, I am thy fellow servant, worship
God.

All these three places teach, that we must not give unto creatures
that worship which belongs unto God, nor to living men, the ho-
nour which we owe unto the Saints that already enjoy their glory.
Where then is *Sathans* deceit, in the adoration of Saints?

Confutation of the Inuocation of Saints by the
holy Scriptures.

MOVLIN.

Our Confession condemneth the intercession of Saints,
that is, it condemneth those which employ them for inter-
cessors, and pray them to be intercessors for them: which
prayer is a religious worship. Now the Church of Rome
commandeth the adoration of Saints and their reliques, but
setteth downe distinctions of adoration, one proper to God,
which they call *Latria*, the other (which is referred to Saints)
they call *Dulia*; which are both religious worships, and an act
of religion. For the inuocation of Saints which is vsed in the
Church of Rome, is a part of the publike seruice, and when
men pray kneeling before their Images, they haue their re-
course vnto them as to those to whom men owe a religious
seruice, that know their hearts, and that haue power to heare
them.

Against this abuse our Confession quotheth these three
places of Scripture, wherein are condemned, the worship
which *Cornelius* would haue giuen to *Peter*, that which the
Lysitrians would haue giuen to *Paul*, and that which *Iohn*
would haue giuen to the Angell. In which places there is no
mention made of two sorts of worshipping, but generally all
religious worshipping of creatures is forbidden. And withall
there is no apparence, that *Cornelius*, a man which feared
God,

God, was so dull to thinke Saint Peter to be the soueraigne God, or that an equall honour (due to the soueraigne God) belonged vnto him. Touching Saint Iohn, that would haue adored the Angell that spake vnto him, for the which the Angell rebuked him, saying, *Take heed thou do it not, I am thy fellow seruant, worship God:* you must know, that twise Saint Iohn would haue worshipped the Angell, one Reuel. 19. 10. the other 22. 9. and that after the first time that the Angell rebuked him, saying, *Worship God, I am thy fellow seruant,* it is an euident prooffe, that the second time when Saint Iohn would haue worshipped him, he knew well that it was not God, seeing the Angell told him so before: but being afraid, he would haue given him some inferiour worship, which neuerthelesse the Angell refused. If that Angell had bene a Romish Catholicke, he would haue spoken to Saint Iohn in this manner: *The worship which thou gapest me, is too high for me, I will be content with a meener worship, and an adoration of Dulia: for that of Latria belongeth onely vnto God.* But that Angell had not learned so farre. So when the Orthodoxe Diuines called the Arrians Idolaters because they worshipped Iesus Christ, whom they held to be but a creature; the Arrians might well haue excused themselves, by saying that they worshipped Iesus Christ with an inferiour worship. But then they acknowledged but one religious worship, and that due to God onely.

Reade Athanasius in the life of S. Anthony.

2 Saint Iames the Apostle, 1. 6. will haue vs to pray in faith and wauer not. Now the prayer made to Saints cannot be made in faith, seeing that God hath not commaunded it in his word. For faith is by hearing of the word of God, Rom. 10. 17. But that prayer vnto Saints is not commaunded in the word of God, M. Cotton the Iesuite in the first booke of his Institution, in the chapter of Inuocation of Saints, confesseth it, saying: *Taunting a commandement to pray vnto, and to call vpon the Saints, the Church neuer taught that there was ever any such commandement.* Then if it be not a commandement of God, it is a commandement of men: seeing that in the publicke Seruice of the Romish Church, and in the Letanies, the Saints

Saints are called vpon, the people are bound thereunto, and it is not in any particular mans power to dispense with himselfe therein.

3 The Apostle Saint Paul, Rom. 10. 14. maintaineth, that we cannot call vpon any other then on him in whom we beleue, saying; *How shall they call on him in whom they haue not beleued?* Our Creed teacheth vs to beleue in God, Father, Sonne, and holy Ghost. And Ioh. 14. 1. *You beleene in God, beleene also in me.* Then it is manifest, that Saint Paul without exception reproveth all inuocation of creatures. And if any man will induce a second religious inuocation, he ought to proue it by the word of God.

4 The same Apostle, Galat. 4. 8. saith, *Then when ye knew not God, ye did seruice vnto them which by nature are not gods.* The Church of Rome seruing Saints and Angels, serueth those who by their nature are no gods. Now it is to be noted, that in the Greeke there is; *δουλοῦμαι*, that is to say, *you giue Dulia*, which is the seruice which the Church of Rome giueth vnto Saints. The Apostle reproveth the Galathians for giuing Dulia to any other but to God.

5 The Scripture is full of places which command vs to addresse all our prayers vnto God. The Apostles desired Iesus Christ saying, *Teach vs to pray*; and he said vnto them, *When ye pray, say, Our Father which art in heauen.* We must teach this lesson to those that pray vnto Saints, and say vnto them, *When you pray, say, Our Father which art in heauen.* God in the Psalme: 50. 15. saith, *Call vpon me in the day of trouble, and I will deliuer thee*; and in the same Psalme, verse 14. *Offer vnto God thanksgiving, and pay thy vowes vnto the most High.* How many are there in the Church of Rome, that make vowes to Saints, or that vow to go on pilgrimage to them, or to offer vnto them? Deut. 6. 13. *Thou shalt feare the Lord thy God, and serue him, and shalt sweare by his Name.* The Catechisme of the Councell of Trent teacheth the contrarie, saying. We sweare by the crosse, by relickes, and by the names of Saints. To sweare by any one, is to acknowledge him to be a witnesse of the integrity of our consciences, and a reuenger of perjury; which agreeth

Luke 11. 13.

In the exposition of the third Commandment.

agreeth not with relickes. To say, that swearing by the relickes of Saints, we sweare by God that loueth the Saints, is to accuse the Prophets & the Apostles herein, that knowing well, that God loued *Abraham, Isaac, and Iacob*, they did not sweare by their relickes. By the same reason I might worship the Sunne, and sweare by heauen, and say, that I do it to honour God that made it.

6 Iesus Christ, Matthew 4. 10. said to Sathan, *Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him onely shalt thou serue*: thereby confuting Sathan, that offered him all the kingdomes of the world if he would worship him. Who doubts not but that Sathan would haue bene content with an inferiour worship? Our Sauour might haue confuted Sathan, either by the dignitie of his person, as being the Sonne of God, or by the indignity of Sathan, as being the principall slave of hell. But he chose rather to send him to that rule whereby all adoration of creatures is forbidden.

7 But seeing that our aduersaries make two sorts of good workes, one commanded by God, the other onely counselled, and perfecter then those that are commanded, I would gladly know in what place they put the inuocation of Saints. For seeing that our aduersaries do acknowledge that God hath not commanded it, to be a good worke it must be counselled, and by consequence the inuocation of Saints is a perfecter worke then calling vpon God. In the meane time there is no man so brutishly superstitious, that seeing two men kneeling on their knees, whereof the one prayeth vnto God, the other to Saint *Francis*, but will confesse, that he which prayeth vnto God, doth a better worke then the other.

8 Particularly for the inuocation and seruice of Angels, we haue an expresse passage of the Apostle, Colossians 2. 18. *Let no man at his pleasure bear rule over you by humbleness of minde, and worshipping of Angels, insinuating himselfe into those things which he neuer saw*. Let men as much as they will diuine the meaning of Saint Paul in this place, yet it is certaine that he generally prohibiteth the seruice of Angels, and by consequence that which is practised in the Church of Rome.

Rome. And in the Church of the old Testament, when Angels appeared vnto men, and visibly did those messages and commissions wherein God employed them, yet the faithfull neuer did ordaine any religious seruice to be done vnto them. In all the publike Seruice prescribed in the bookes of *Moses*, there is nothing spoken of any seruice done to Angels in the Tabernacle. And I would gladly know why now, when their ayde is lesse sensible, they ought rather to be serued and called vpon. *Theodoret* in his commentarie vpon this place, saith *Those that forbade the Law, brought in this seruice of Angels, saying, that the Law was giuen by their interposition. This vice continued a long time among them of Phrygia and Pisidia. Therefore the Synod assembled in Laodicea the capital Citie of Phrygia, by expresse ordinance forbade them to pray vnto Angels; and yet at this day we see among them and their neighbours, Oratories or Chappels to pray in to Saint Michael: which those that maintained them said they did in humilitie, saying that the God of the whole world is inuisible, incomprehensible, and unaccessible; and therefore that they had need to make God fauourable vnto them by Angels. And that is it which Saint Paul said, in humblenesse and seruice of Angels.* There are three things to be noted in this excellent place. The first, that *Theodoret* beleued that the Councell of Laodicea forbade prayer to Angels. The second, that he condemned the Chappels made to pray to *S. Michael*, which neuerthelesse are vsed in the Romish Church. The third, that those heretickes whereof he speaketh, vsed the same words that the Church of Rome doth, which is, that to make God fauourable vnto them, they haue their recourse to Angels and Saints, with deuotion and humilitie of spirit. *Baronius* is angrie, and chideth *Theodoret* for writing in this manner, in the first Tome of his Annals in the sixtieth yeare. *By this* (saith he) *we may see that Theodoret did not well understand the sense of Saint Pauls words.* In such manner our aduersaries respect the Fathers.

The Canon of the Councill of Laodicea whereof Theodor^{pace dictum}
et makes mention, is the five and thirtieth Canon, the words ^{(sic) affectum}
whereof are these: *Christians must not leave the Church of* ^{esse Pauli ver-}
God. ^{borum sensum.}

* *ad delictum
vnde hunc
monitum in
admonitione
in omni
in omni
in omni
in omni*

God to go to worship Angels, and to meet together in congregations apart, which are things prohibited. * If any one shall be found to use this sort of idolatry, let him be accounted, because he hath forsaken our Lord Iesus Christ. Those Fathers were of opinion that men could not call vpon Angels without leauing the Church and renouncing Iesus Christ. For that cause also Saint *Augustine* in his booke of Heresies, putteth the Angelicans among the heretiques, which were *Angelorum cultus inclinati*, inclined or bent to the seruice of Angels.

* *Ecclēsia non
in uocacionibus
Angelica
facit aliquid,
sed mundi,
propter
manifestationes
dirigens ad
Deum, &c.*

Irenaeus in his second booke, 58. Chapter, ioyneth with the Apostle Saint Paul, saying. * The Church doeth nothing by Angelicall inuocations, but purely, simply, and manifestly addresseth her prayers to God which hath made all things, in the name of our Lord Iesus Christ.

The ordinarie excuse is, that men haue access to God by the Saints and Angels, as they haue access to kings by their officers and attendants. But the case is not all one. For kings are not in all places, neither vnderstand all things, and it is not fit that every man should speake vnto them, and they haue need to be informed of the truth of things by others. In God it is cleane contrarie. And which is more, it is God which frameth prayers in our hearts, Rom. 8. 25. 26. Whereupon it followeth, that the prayer which God himselfe inspirith into our hearts, is pleasing or acceptable vnto him without the recommendation of the Saints. Should not the voyce of the Spirit of God speaking in our hearts be pleasing vnto God? Besides we haue already shewed that our aduersaries do cleane contrary to that which they say, and haue recourse by God to Saints. And albeit God were in all things like vnto kings, yet when the king calls, we must go directly to him. But he saith, *Come to me*, Math. 11. 28, and call vpon me, Psal. 50. 15.

Places of Scripture for the Invocation of Saints.

ARNOVL.

Contrary places of Scripture. 2 Peter 1. 15. *I will endeavour to have you often after my departing to the end that you may have remembrance of these things.* 2. Sect.

Here is Saint Peter which promisseth to pray for them after his death. And Geneva seeing the force of this place, set downe in these termes according to the originall, and the common translation, hath changed the order of these words by a manifest depravation: putting this particule that before these words, before my departing, which is not found in the Greeke originall.

MOVLIN.

The onely reading of this place of Saint Peter as *M. Armon* alledgeth it, prooveth the falshood: for there is neither sence nor reason in these words, *I will endeavour to have you often after my departing, to the end that you may have remembrance of these things.*

This is the place according to the Greeke: *I will endeavour therefore alwayes, that ye also may be able to have remembrance of these things after my departing.* This word may in Greeke be *μνησθαι*, which signifieth to have meane. Yong scholars that haue but a little vnderstanding in Greeke, may easily comprehend, that this is the sence of the Greeke in the Apostle. And if it were so that we had no vnderstanding of the Greeke at all, the whole sence of the place it selfe forceth vs to vnderstand it so. For Saint Peter in the verses before, and also in this, yeeldeth a reason vnto the faithfull why he wrote vnto them, which was, that perceiuing himselfe to be neare his death, he would leaue a remembrance of his instructions, that they might haue a meane after his death often to remember that which he had said vnto them in his life time. This is the whole place: *For I thinke it meete as long as I am in this tabernacle, to stirre you up, by putting you in remembrance, seeing I know that the time is at hand that I must lay downe this tabernacle.*

sabernacle, even as our Lord Iesus hath shewed me. I will endeavour therefore alwayes, that ye also may be able to have remembrance of these things after my departing. And so the greatest part of our aduersaries which haue translated or written Commentaries vpon this Epistle vnderstand it, as *Arias Montanus*, Cardinall *Casertus*, the ordinary Glosse: And aboute all, *Thomas* the Prince of Schooles, is very formall in his Commentary vpon this Epistle: Because (saith he) that I must soone depart, therefore while I live I will endeavour my selfe by aduertising you not onely once, but often times also, that is to say, instantly and diligently, that you may haue a remembrance of the things aforesaid after my death. *Oecumenius* saith, that this exposition is the plainest, and that the other is hyperbaticall, that is to say, ouerthrowing and troubling the construction.

Neuerthelesse, if it were as true as it is false and absurd, that *Saint Peter* promised the faithfull to pray for them after his death, what is that to the purpose? If *Saint Peter* being in heauen prayeth for the Church, doth it follow that we ought to call vpon him? doth it follow that he knowes our hearts?

ARNOUX.

And in *Reuelation* 5. 8. The foure and twenty Elders fell downe before the Lambe, bearing euery one harper and golden vials full of odour, which are the prayers of the Saints. *Reade*, and it is sufficient.

MOVLIN.

The reading of this passage sufficeth to shew that the same toucheth not the question. The question is, whether we must pray vnto and call vpon the Saints. Whereupon *M. Arnoux* alledgeth a place which saith, that the Saints presented their prayers. This place saith, that the Saints prayed in heauen, but saith not, that we must pray vnto them here on earth.

Quia cito transiurus, ideo dum vivo dabo operam, vos commendo, non solum semel, sed & frequenter, id est, instanter & diligenter habere vos, id est, vt habeatis memoriam predicatorum post obitum meum.

83. Sect.
M. Arnoux
hath put two
harper.

*In the same XXIII. Article of the Confession
of our faith.*

We hold Purgatorie to be an illusion comming out
of Sathans shop, from whence also proceedeth Mo-
nasticall vowes, pilgrimages, abstinence from meates,
auricular confession, indulgences, &c.

Of Purgatorie.

ARNOVE.

*Touching places of Scripture noted in the margin of the Con-
fession, there are none at all but against abstinence from meates,
and obseruation of holy dayes; upon which the Reader may see my
reply to the Ministers.* 84. Sect.

They haue with the selfe same faithfulness cut off the Canoni-
call bookes, before in the third Article, and denyed all these things,
whereof one part may be proued by the bookes which for that pur-
pose they haue cut off. In such manner, that after they haue cut
the throats of the witnesses that might accuse them, they haue
boldly committed a kinde of parricide.

MOVLIN.

It was not needfull to note places in the Margent against
Purgatorie, nor against Monasticall vowes, pilgrimages,
prohibition of marriage and of meates, auricular con-
fession, and Indulgences or pardons, because the places no-
ted in the margin of the fifth Article of our Confession,
where humane traditions are condemned, and the perfection
of the Scriptures proued, are sufficient to overthrow and
confute those points, which are humane traditions, invented

for gaine and for ambition. Besides, the margent had not bene great enough to confute so many points briefly touched in one Article. This Doctor being not able to disgrace the body of our Confession, seeketh to scratch at the margents thereof.

Touching the cutting off of the Canonickall bookes whereof we are accused, I haue heretofore sufficiently satisfied the Reader therein, and cleared our Churches of that slander. And I say, that if we should allow of Iudith, Wisedome, and the Macchabees to be Canonickall bookes, our Aduersaries should not therein find their religion, no more then in the bookes of the Prophets and the Apostles. And *M. Arnaud* before in the 69. Section sought to serue his turne about merites with a place out of an Apocryphall booke, but by falsifying it most horribly.

Then although I might leave those points as they are, against the which *M. Arnaud* produceth nothing but iniurious words; yet for the better satisfaction of the Reader I will say something of euery one of them.

Of the description of Purgatorie.

By *Self.*
Lib. 4. cap. 1.

To confute Purgatorie, we neede but paint it out, and shew it in the true colours thereof. *Belle* the Iesuite in his Catechisme of Controuersies, and *Cotton* the Iesuite in his Institutions, say that Purgatorie is a prison or gaole, and a place vnder the ground, aboue hell where the damned are, where the soules that are laden and defiled with veniall sins, and which haue not here on earth satisfied the diuine Justice, are purged by that temporall fire. Yet they make that fire to be as hotte as that in hell, and very long; witnesse the pardons of diuers thousands of yeares.

This doctrine is cruell, and beareth her condemnation in her forehead. For our aduersaries will haue:

That God which hath given his Sonne to die for the redemption

redemption of his enemies, taketh pleasure to burne his children for their sinnes already pardoned, and for the which Iesus Christ hath made satisfaction.

2 That God tormenteth his elect in a fire, not for their amendment (for they are iustified already before they enter thereinto) but to satisfie himselfe, and to content his iustice. No father euer punished his children in such manner.

3 That God, to satisfie his iustice, exceedeth in iustice, taking two payments for one selfesame debt; and two satisfactions for one sinne, that is, the passion of Iesus Christ, and the paines of Purgatory; although the first satisfaction, which is the passion of Iesus Christ, is most sufficient, as well for Purgatorie as for hell.

4 That the passion of Iesus Christ being sufficient to exempt vs from Purgatorie as well as from hell, neuertheless God accepteth not the passion of his Sonne for as much as it is worth, but closeth his hand, and restraineth his liberality, and cutteth off some of the worth of Iesus Christs death, that his children may not be exempted from torment.

5 That the passion of Iesus Christ is applied vnto vs by burning and tormenting vs for many yeares; which is to apply the mercie of God by the execution of his iustice, to apply pardon by punishment, to apply the remission of our debts, by making vs pay them; and briefly, to apply the benefit and grace of Iesus Christ, by a meanes derogating from this grace, and contrary to that benefit.

6 That Iesus Christ making intercession in heaven for all the faithfull, their burning soules come not out of that fire by his intercession, but that they come forth by the Popes pardons.

7 That the Pope hauing power to draw more soules out of that fire then he doth, yet he that boasteth himselfe to be the common father of Christians, lets them borne therein many yeares.

8 That the soules entring into Purgatorie, are already pure and without sinne, and yet haue need of purgation; for the fault remaineth no more, and yet neuertheless they say



It hath need to be purged: So Purgatorie is made to purge foules that are pure without sinne, and to cleanse filthinesse of sinne which is no more in them.

9 That sins pardoned are purged by torment, as if a man should call a whip, a wheele, or a gibet a purgation.

10 That sins fully pardoned, are punished in this fire, and that God having fully defaced and taken away the fault, makes them endure paine that haue no more fault, and are no more culpable. As if God should say vnto vs, I forgive thee all thy finnes, but thou shalt be punished in a fire. I forgive thee all thy debt, but not the payment of the debt: for our sins are debts, whereof the punishment is the payment. Certainly pardon is no other thing, then not to punish. And a guiltie person would be very well content that the King should not forgive him his fault, so he would remit the punishment. Iesus Christ tooke our sins vpon him, to the end that we should be discharged of the punishment. It had bene in vaine for him to haue borne all our satisfactorie punishment, if he had not discharged vs of it.

11 That God will haue vs fully and freely to pardon our neighbours, and holdeth him for a wicked man that hauing bene iniured by his neighbour, would pardon his offence, but neuerthelesse would determine to make him endure punishment for it. Whereby it followeth, that God will haue vs to be more mercifull then himselfe: seeing that our aduersaries say, that after God hath pardoned all our offences, he maketh vs suffer and endure satisfactory punishments in a burning fire many yeares.

12 All these abuses spring from a peruerse maxime which subuerteth all the Gospell, which is, that Iesus Christ by his death exempteth vs from satisfactorie punishments due for sins committed before Baptisme, but not for satisfactorie punishments due for sins after Baptisme. A maxime, whereof there is not one word found in the Scripture: which neuerthelesse ought to be more clearly set downe therein then any other doctrine, seeing that to know what Iesus Christ hath done for vs, is that which makes vs Christians. It is the soule

soule and foundation of Christian religion.

All that which is said before, is an introduction to that which followeth.

13 That the Pope, by vertue of that which Iesus Christ said to *Peter*, *Whatsoever thou shalt loose or vnbide vpon earth, &c.* looseth or vnbideth also vnder the earth, and can deliuer soules out of Purgatorie. And by that power, he giueth five or sixe hundred thousand yeares of pardon, and erecteth priuiledged Altars, whereon whosoever saith a Masse vpon a certaine day, at his choice or pleasure draweth a soule out of Purgatorie; and priuiledgeth certaine persons, to whom he granteth, either not to enter at all into Purgatorie, or to come presently out againe. Such are the white Friers, who boast that they haue a priuiledge to be no longer in Purgatorie then till Saturday next ensuing after their deaths: and the Franciscans or gray Friers, to who Pope *Sixtus V.* in the yeare 1586. granted a free pardon, and a deliuering of a soule out of Purgatorie, for saying of certaine Pater nosters mixed with Ave Marias on Saturday before Palme Sunday, and on the feast day of Saint *Iohn Baptist*, and of *S. Iohn Port-Latin*. In the Treasure of Indulgences of the Franciscan or gray Friers printed in Roan, these words are found; *For euery day, untill the Natinitie of our Lady, there are 862000 yeares and 100 dayes of pardon and remission of the third part of sinnes granted.* The booke of Roman Indulgences speaketh of much more.

By Thomas Darcy in the Iewes street, neare the Pallace, 1614. pag. 119.

14 Thereby there is a great trafficke made of pardons, and the Cleargie by that meanes sucke and draw vnto themselves the substance and treasure of the Laitie, liuing vpon the ignorant feare of poore people, who dying, thinke themselves to be easily quit of the punishment in hell, if they may onely remaine in a burning fire for the space of some hundreds of yeares: and for that cause becaue their children and their heires of their goods, to giue, not vnto those that weepe, but to such as laugh and sing; not to those that want and haue need thereof, but to rich and idle Monkes. For rich men they say store of Masses and Trentals, for which

they pay deare, thereby (as they say) to ease and comfort their soules in that torment; but for the poore, or those that giue them nothing, they neuer say any particular Masses. They die good cheape. They must content themselves with generall prayers, whereof neuerthelesse rich men also haue a part. Towards the poore they will haue God to vse the rule of the Gospell, which is, *Verily I say vnto thee, thou shalt not come out thence vsill thou hast payd the uttermost farthing,* Mathew. 5. 26.

*The opinion of the ancient Fathers, touching the
state of the soules of the faithfull after
they are dead.*

86. Self.

*Neque p[er]
quicquam po-
test anima se-
le sine stabili
materia, id
est, carne.*

**Animam per
se separatim
ignis nunquā
attigerit, nec
sombra qui-
dē ei molestā
fuerint, ve-
ro quā de-
lis carēt, &c.*

**Ne cupit
p[er] se de
m[un]do
venerit, &c.
et, &c.*

The ancient Fathers were so farre off from beleneing that the soules of the faithfull are tormented in a fire before the day of iudgement, that many of them are of opinion, that the soule cannot suffer any torment when it is once separated from the body. *Tertullian* in the fortie eight chapter of his Apologie faith, *The soule alone cannot suffer any torment without solide matter or substance, that is, without the flesh.* He saith the same in his book of the Testimony of the Soule, chapter 4. *Gregorie de Nisse* in the third oration of the Resurrection of Christ, saith, ** Fire can by no meanes touch the soule separated from the body, neither can darkenesse be troublesome vnto it, because it hath no eyes. For these conuenient Reasons, we are moued and perswaded to allow of the resurrection of the dead.*

Chrysostome in his thirte nine Homilie vpon the first of the Corinthians, saith, ** Although the soule remaineth, although it were ten thousand times immortall, as in truth it is, it shall not without the body receiue those vnspeakable blessings, nor suffer any punishment. All the punishment which the soules suffer being separated from their bodies (according to Saint Ambrose, in his 10. chapter of the booke*

of.

of the Benefit of death) is, that they are in great feare and disquietnesse, attending the punishment which is prepared for them at the latter day.

Staying for the latter day, many of the Fathers place the soules both of the good and the wicked, in holes or dennes vnder the earth, or in certaine secret places which they call receptacles. ^a Tertullian, in the 55. chapter of his booke of the Soule, saith, *We hold for certaine, that all the soules are set apart in hell vntill the day of the Lord.* Ireneus saith the like in his fifth booke, grounding vpon this, that Iesus Christ was in hell vntill his resurrection, whose example all the faithfull must follow; ^b For (saith he) the disciple is not above his master.

Origen in his 2. booke of Principles cap. 13. saith, ^c I am of opinion, that all the Saints going out of this world, stay in a place of the earth, which the Scripture calleth Paradise, or in some place of instruction, and as it were in an Auditorie. And from thence he makes the soules to ascend vp by degrees higher and higher.

Lactantius in his seuenth booke cap. 21. saith, ^d All mens soules are kept in a common prison; vntill such time that the great Iudge calleth them to account for all which they haue done.

Saint Hilarie vpon the 38. Psalme saith, ^e It is a law of necessitie, wherunto all men are subiect, that their soules descend downe into hell after their bodies are buried, which descending Iesus Christ himselfe refused not, to accomplish that which belonged vnto his manhood.

Victorinus Martyr, on the 6. of the Reuelation, saith that S. Iohn saw the soules of those that were slaine and martyred vnder the Altar, and saith *Sub ara, id est, sub terra: esteeming that the soules of the Saints are vnder the earth.*

Novatianus in chap. 1. of his booke of the Trinitie, saith, ^f The things that are vnder the earth, are not without power

semper adueniat, quo maximus iudex meritorum faciat examen. ^g Humana ista lex necessitas ut sepultis corporibus anima ad inferos descendant. Quam descensionem Dominus ad consummationem veri homini non recusauit. ^h Quia infra terram iacent neque ipsa sunt digestis & ordinatis potestatibus vacua. Locus enim est quo piorum anima & impiorum ducuntur,

^a Constitui-
mus omnem
animam apud
inferos seque-
strari in diem
Domini.

^b Anima ab-
ierant in inui-
sibilem locum
definitum ipsis
a Deo, & ibi
usque ad re-
formationem
commoraban-
tur.

^c Puto good
sancti quique
descendentes de
hac vita per-
manebunt in loco
aliquo in ter-
ra posito quem
Paradisum
dicit Scriptu-
ra diuina, re-
lucet in quodam
eruditionis lo-
co, & ut ita
dicam audi-
torio.
^d Omnes in vo-
na communi;
custodia deti-
nentur donec

disposed by order: for it is the place whither the soules of the faithfull and of the wicked are carried, having already a preface of the future Iudgement.

a Post idem
istam mundum
eris ubi erunt
sancti, quibus
dicitur, Venite
et habitate cum
mihi. Nondum ubi
eris, quia
nescis?
b Nam vel
mortaliter pe-
regnat in ter-
ra, vel in eis qui mor-
tem obierunt
secretis an-
gustiarum recep-
taculis, sed il-
lic usque re-
quiescent.
c Tempus
quod inter ho-
minis mortem
et resurrectionem
interpositum
est, animas
aditis recep-
taculis conti-
net, sicut una-
queque digna
est vel requie
vel tormento.
d In istis
locis ubi mor-
tali ratione re-
solvitur, et
condemnat, et
condemnat.

Saint *Augustine* is very uncertaine in this matter, yet these are his words vpon the 36. Psalm: "After this short life, thou shalt not yet be in the place where the Saints shall be, to whom it shall be said, Come ye blessed of my Father, &c. Thou shalt not yet be there: who knows not that? But thou maist be there where the proud rich man being in torment saw the miserable poore man rest, in which rest thou shalt remaine quietly till the day of iudgement. And in his 11. booke of the Citie of God, chapter 9. he saith, "That part of the Citie of God that should be ioyned to the immortall Angels, being an assembly of mortall men, is either a pilgrimage on earth in a mortall condution, or as touching those that are dead, consisteth in the hidden receptacles and seats of the soules."

And in his *Manuell to Laurentius*, chapter 109. he saith "The time that is betweene death and the last resurrection, holdeth the soules in secret receptacles, according as every one is worthy of rest or torment."

Chrysostome, in his eight and twentieth Homilie, vpon the Epistle to the Hebrewes, saith, "That *Abel* hath not yet receiued the crowne, nor *Noah*, and that they are set in a place staying for vs; and that that place where the soules stay, by the Fathers is ordinarily called *Abrahams Bosome*. And yet neuerthelesse, as well in *Chrysostome* as in *Augustine* there are places found, which say that the soules of the faithfull leauing their bodies, go straight to Iesus Christ, and see God face to face. And Saint *Augustine* in his first booke and fourteenth chapter of *Retractions* moueth this question, and leaueth it vndecided without resolution. Whereupon also *Sixtus Senensis* keeper of the Popes Librarie, in his first booke three hundred fortie and fifth Annotation, saith, that the Church had not as yet resolued vpon any certainty touching that Article.

Almost all the Greeke Fathers deferre the blessednesse of mens

mens soules vntill the resurrection, as *Theodoretus*, *Arctus*, *Occumenius*, *Theophylactus*, and *Euthymius*; with whom Pope *Iohn* the 22. ioyned, as *Gerson* in his Sermon of Easter witnesseth. *Villanus* in the tenth booke of his Historie, and *Erasmus* in his Preface vpon the fifth of *Irenaus*: And *Okam* in his worke of 93. dayes: the rest of the soules in their receptacles by some ancient Fathers is called a sleeping. The Canon of the Masse prayeth for the dead in these termes: *Remember O Lord thy seruants which sleepe in the slumber of peace.* For when that prayer was hatcht, they did not beleue that the soules of the children of God were tormented in a fire.

Many did not beleue that the soules should come out of those receptacles all at one time, and that some should not rise so soone as others, that is, such as were heauier laden with sinnes, which should be punished by the delaying of their resurrection. *Modicum quodque delictum mora resurrectionis luendo*: as *Tertullian* in the last chapter of his booke of the Soule faith. And following that error he will haue a woman to pray for her husband that is dead, * *and that she aske some refreshing for him, and keepe him company in the first resurrection*, in his booke of Monogamia, cap. 10. Which also is conformable to the prayer which * *Ambrose* made for *Gratian* and *Valentinian* that were dead, desiring God that it would please him, *to releeme and raise them up in the best time.*

But I find the Fathers agree in nothing more then in this opinion, that as soone as the dead shall be risen, they shall be singed and burnt by the fire of the day of iudgement, which they call a Baptisme of fire, and the flaming sword at the entrie of Paradise, from which fire they exempt no man, no not the Apostles, nor the virgine *Mario*.

Ambrose in his twentieth Sermon vpon the 118. Psalm, faith, * *Euery man must passe through the flame, whether it be Iohn the Euangelist whom God loved, or Saint Peter.* And in his third Sermon vpon the 36. Psalm * *The spoues of Leui shall be purged by fire. Ezechiel, Daniel, and these although they shall be examined by fire, shall neuer be lesse say, we haue passed through fire and water.*

* *Refrigerium ei adposuimus, & in prima resurrectione consortium.*

* *Ut ait sanctus, de obitu Valentiniani, Te quasi summo Deus, & charissimos iuuenes matura resurrectione suscites & resuscites.*

* *Omnes oportet transire per flammam, sive illa Iohannis, sive illa Evangelistae, sive illa Petrus.*

* *igne purgabitur filij Leui, & ne Ezechiel, igne Daniel, &c.*

Lactantius

of fire whereof Iesus Christ speaketh, is vnderstood the triall that shall be made at the day of Iudgement. *Gregorie de Nisse* speaketh of the same purging fire, in his Oration of those that sleepe. And *Cyri* of Ierusalem in the fiftieth Chatechisme, saying¹ That at the day of Iudgement the Lord will come in the clouds from heauen; drawing after him a stound of fire, to trie men.

ἡ ἕρπης ὁ υἱὸς
τοῦ ἀνθρώπου
ἐν τῇ ᾗ ἐρχομένου
ἐν πυρὶ πυρὸς
ἐκ τῶν νεφελῶν
ἀγαθῶν ἡ
ἀνθρώπων.

Such is the Purgatorie of the ancient Fathers, and not a fire vnder the ground, where the soules of the faithfull should be burnt before the day of Iudgement for sinnes that are pardoned, nor a prison whereof the Pope is the Iaylour. And all the seruice and the prayers for the dead which are said in the Romish Church, do not in any sort speake of the fire of Purgatorie, but of the sleeping of the soule, & not that they are cast into eternall fire. So the Greeke Churches pray for the dead, and deny Purgatorie. *Epiphanius* in the heresie of *Aerius*, and *Demis* in the booke of the Ecclesiasticall Hierarchy speaketh of prayer for the dead, and neuertheless presupposeth that the dead for whom they pray are already in rest and blessednesse. Saint *Augustine* in his booke of the Care for the dead, approueth prayer for the dead, but in all that booke speaketh not one word of Purgatorie. The second booke of *Macchabees*, chapter 12. commendeth prayer for the dead, when in that prayer men haue a regard vnto the resurrection: that is to say, when we pray for one that is dead, that he may rise to saluation, but not to draw him out of Purgatorie. The Ancients prayed, and gaue gifts, and made offerings for the dead to the end aforesaid, to wit, for the quiet resting of soules for the resurrection, and that the dead may rise one of the first, and to the end that he may be friendly handled by the purging fire of the day of iudgement; but neuer to draw a soule out of Purgatorie. And to conclude: in all antiquity there is no mention made of priuiledged Altars, whereon he that causeth a Masse to be said, draweth a soule out of Purgatorie at his choise, nor of pardons given by the Pope to the dead.

In the time of Pope *Gregorie* the first, that wrote in anno

1095.

595.

395, Sathan hatched that which the ages ensuing haue disclosed. For by the fourth booke of Dialogues written by this Pope, you may see that then they placed Purgatorie in the wind, in the smoke of bathes, and in riuers. At last Purgatorie was put vnder the ground, and placed neare to hell. *Bellarmino* in his second booke of Purgatory and sixt chapter saith, That in a manner all the Doctors are of one accord, that the damned and the soules in Purgatorie are in one selfesame place, and are tormented all alike. And yet when the soules come out of that fire, they will not haue them presently to enter into Paradise. For *Beda*, and after him *Bellarmino* in the seventh chapter of his first booke of Purgatory, will haue the soules when they come out of that fire, to refresh themselves for a while in a meadow full of flowers which is neare to that place. Which is a subiect of profound speculation, as if there were greene meadowes full of flowers in the concavities vnder ground, where there is no Sunne: and as if the soules could smell flowers, then who mowes those meadowes? This fabulous doctrine, forged to entice the Clergie, and to affright the consciences of the ignorant, must be examined by the word of God.

Confutation of Purgatorie by the word of God.

87. Sect.

This doctrine agreeth not with the holy Scripture, wherein there is no mention made of seruice nor sacrifice made to draw mens soules out of a fire after this life, nor of any power giuen to the Apostles to deliuer any soules out of Purgatorie, nor of any priuiledged altars, nor of any pardons giuen to the dead. All this proceeds from the vnwritten word.

The second booke of *Machabees*, which we haue proued not to be canonically, in the 12. chapter speaketh of praying for the dead, and saith, that that prayer is made hauing respect to the resurrection, that is, to the end that the dead may rise to saluation,

saluation, but not to draw them out of Purgatory. On the contrary, there it is said, that if *Juda* had not hoped that the dead should rise againe, it had bene a superfluous thing, and full of follie, to pray for the dead. Then the prayer for the dead which is made in the Romish church, by the iudgement of the Author of that booke, is foolish, because it is not made in hope, or with any regard of the resurrection, but to pull mens soules out of a burning fire.

3 The holy Scriptures giue vs many examples of men that when they died entred into blessednes, Luk. 2. 29. *Simeon* made account to enter into rest by his death, saying, *Lord now lettest thou thy servant depart in peace, according to thy word.* Luke 16. 22. *Lazarus* soule is by Angels carried into *Abrahams* bosome, where it is comforted while the wicked rich man was tormented. *Iesus Christ* said to the good theeſe at his death, *This day shall thou be with me in Paradise.*

4 They make answer, that these are exceptions which derogate nothing from the generall rule. But they that say so, ought to produce that generall rule, and find it in the Scriptures. These people will haue, that in the Scripture there should be nothing but exceptions without rules. At the least, if they want rules, let them find one onely example of a soule that is sent to that fire. But they neither produce examples nor rules. Contrariwise we produce a whole age, where in all those that shall liue, shall be exempted from Purgatory, that is, those that shall be aliue in the world when the day of iudgement shall happen. Seeing then you see so many men that shall be saued without Purgatory, and that the Pope himselfe exempteth many from it, why cannot God exempt the rest, without doing wrong to his iustice?

5 The Prophet *Esay* 57. 1. speaketh thus of the death of the faithfull: *The righteous is taken away from the euill to come: he shall enter into peace, they shall rest in their beds, each one walking in his vprightnesse.* The Spirit of God, *Reuel.* 2. 10. saith, *Be thou faithfull vnto the death, and I will giue thee the crowne of life.* Then the faithfull by death obtaine the crowne of life, and are not cast into a fire vnder the ground. And *Saint Paul*, 2. Cor.

5. 1. saith, *For we know, that if our earthly house of this tabernacle be destroyed, we haue an eternall house in heauen.* And Reuel. 14. 13. *The dead which die in the Lord, are fully blessed; when so saith the Spirit, for they rest from their labors; and their works follow them.* The Apostle Heb. 9. 27. saith, *It is appointed vnto men that they shall die once, and after that cometh the iudgement.* He should say as the Papists say, and after that Purgatorie.

6. The wise man in Ecclesiastes 12. 7. saith, *Then shall the dust returne to the earth as it was, but the spirit shall returne vnto God who gaue it.* And the Apostle Rom. 8. 1. saith, *There is no condemnation to them that are in Christ Iesus.* If no condemnation, then in no eternall fire, nor in no temporall fire. And Iesus Christ, Ioh: 5. 24. saith, *He that heareth my word, and beleeueth on him that sent me, hath euertlasting life, and shall not come into iudgement, but hath passed from death vnto life.* Then he entreteth not into a fire like to that wherein the damned are.

7. And seeing that our aduersaries hold the booke of Wisdom to be canonical, why do they contradict the words thereof, cap. 3. 6. which are so euident and cleare, saying, *The soules of the righteous are in the hands of God, there shall no torment touch them.* For they hold that the soules in Purgatorie are righteous.

8. Adde hereunto the places alledged, and the reasons at large produced against Satisfaction in generall, wherein we haue shewed how castigatorie punishments are compatible with full pardon, and are benefices and spirituall cures, but not satisfactory punishments. Where also we haue shewed how S. Iohn in his first Epistle, 1. 7. saith, *That the blood of Iesus Christ cleanseth vs from all sinne.* And Saint Paul Col. 2. 13. saith, *That God hath freely forgiven vs all our trespasses.* He saith all, and freely, to the end to exclude all satisfaction on our parts to the Iustice of God. For if we must satisfie the Iustice of God by our torments, we can neuer make satisfaction for the least part of our finnes, for that God receiueth no satisfaction but that which is most exact and complete; for the Scripture telleth vs, *that he which calleth his brother foole shall be punished with bell fire,* Mat. 5. 22. And *that no railers shall inherit*

berite the kingdome of God, 1. Cor. 6. 10. Faults wherewith euen the better sort of Christians are sometimes ouertaken.

9 The proofes drawne from the definition are demonstratiue. To know then whether God pardoneth our offences without any satisfiying punishments on our behalfe, we must know what it is to pardon. I say then, that *to pardon*, is to remit the penalty or punishment deserued, and not to impose anie satisfiying punishments, nor to take any vengeance or reuenge. Now God forgiueth vs all our offences, and doth it freely; therefore he expecteth no punishment nor satisfactory paines from vs.

10 God also is a most gracious father. Now a Father (if he be not altogether vnnatural) neuer correcteth his children to draw any satisfaction from them, but giueth correction to amend them. The afflictions of this present life serue to amend vs, and not to appease his wrath. But the torments of Purgatorie serue not to amend a sinner, seeing that there the soules sinne no more. They will haue them onely serue to satisfie the iustice of the Iudge. Then they are not corrections of a father, but punishments of an angrie Iudge.

11 All satisfactory punishment is a satisfaction for a fault. Now when the fault is wholly remitted, there is no more satisfactory punishment to be endured.

12 And all purgation is to cleanse some filthinesse or spott; but in the fire of Purgatorie no spots or filthinesse are purged; for paine is not a spot nor a filthinesse, but the fault. The fault then being abolished and pardoned, what is there more to be purged?

13 To say, that after the king hath pardoned a man he will haue him to make satisfaction to the partie offended, is nothing to the purpose. For the king and the partie are two. But here the king which is God, is also the partie, who being reconciled, and hauing remitted all his right, there resteth no more parties to be contented, nor satisfaction to be made vnto iustice.

14 To say that the benefit of Iesus Christs passion is applied vnto vs by burning and tormenting vs in a fire, it is not onely,

onely to speake without authority of the Scripture, but also to contrary the Scripture, which saith, Heb. 1. 3. *That Iesus Christ hath himselfe purged our finnes.* Then not by fire, nor by the tormenting of soules which he hath bought with so great a price.

15 Touching the ease and comfort which the soules in Purgatory receiue by the prayers of the liuing, Ecclesiastes 9. 5. 6. saith, *That the dead haue not any more reward, neither haue they any more portion for ever in anything that is done vnder the Sunne.* Therefore God who in his Law ordained sacrifices and purifications for all sorts of finnes and corporall filthinesses, euen for the Leaper, and for touching and handling of the dead; ordained not any sacrifice nor propitiation for the dead.

Neuerthelesse, to maintaine this fire, our aduersaries gather heapes of straw, that is; some small and light places out of the Scripture, whereat I wonder how they can be so ill aduised; seeing that the same places are of no value for their purpose.

They alledge Luke 12. 58. 59. which saith, *While thou goest with thine aduersarie to the magistrate, as thou art in the way, give diligence that thou maist be deliuered from him, lest he draw thee to the Iudge, and the Iudge deliuer thee to the Iaylor, and the Iaylor cast thee into prison. I tell thee, thou shalt not depart thence till thou hast payed the vtmost mite.* And Matth. 5. 25. saith, *Agree with thine aduersary quickly, in stead of these words, Give diligence in the way that thou maist be deliuered from him.* Our aduersaries will haue the way to signifie life, the Magistrate God, and the prison the fire of Purgatory, the aduersarie the diuell; and by consequence they would haue vs to agree with the diuell. And if in this place it is meant that the diuell is the aduersarie, who shall be the executioner? And are we in the way with the diuell? for Saint *Matthew* saith, *Agree with thine aduersary quickly whilest thou art in the way with him.* For these causes some of them will haue the diuell to be the fergeant, and the Law the aduersarie; which is yet worse. For doth the diuell draw the faithfull into Purgatory? Are we

in the way with the Law? Is the Law of God our enemy? Are we to seeke means to deliuer our selues from it, and to shake off the yoke thereof? For *Saint Luke* saith, that we must giue diligence in the way, that we may be deliuered from our aduersarie. And what absurditie is it, to call a prison a burning somace? And how is Purgatorie a prison, from whence the soules shall not come forth till they haue paid the last farthing, seeing that the Pope, by pardons, taketh soules from thence before satisfaction is fully accomplished? And, albeit we should receiue and allow of their Allegories for demonstrations, and according to the sense which it pleaseth them to giue them; yet in the end they must proue that this Purgatorie is a fire, and not a water, or a field couered ouer with snow, wherein the soules wash, or roile and turne themselves; for in this place there is no more spoken of fire then of water.

The sence of this place is cleare and manifest. *Iesus Christ* exhorteth vs to peace and concord with our neighbours that trouble vs, and counselleth vs not to wrangle and strue with them in law. That is the counsell which *Saint Paul* giueth, 1. Cor. 6. 4. to end our controuersies rather by the aduice and arbitration of brethren of the Church; then to go to law before Iudges that are infidels. So *Saint Ambrose* expoundeth the twelfth of *Saint Luke*, where he saith, that *Iesus Christ* speaketh, * To make peace betweene brethren that are at variance. *Hilarie* likewise in his fourth Canon vpon *Saint Matthew*. And * *Hierome* in his Annotations vpon the fifth of *Saint Matthew*. Among the Greekes, *Chrysostome*, *Eusebiius*, and *Theophylactus* vpon the first of *Saint Matthew*. *Malodonat* the Iesuite vpon the same place, by the prison vnderstandeth hell, by the Sergeant, the diuell. But *Barradius* the Iesuite, and Cardinall *Tolet* vpon the twelfth of *Saint Luke*, expound this place as we do.

Some alledge these words of the Apostle, 1. Corin. 15. 29. *What shall they do which are baptized for the dead, if the dead rise not at all?* From whence they inferre, with incomparable subtiltie, that therefore there must needs be a Purgatorie.

Q

* De reconcilianda pace
diffidentium
fratrum.

* Manifestum
est Iesum, quod
non Dominum
et Seruitor
nostri dum in
seculi via
curramus, sed
parentes con-
uertamus in
seculum.

catolic. To prove Purgatorie in that sort, is silently to confesse, that there is none. By being baptized they vnderstand, to be afflicted from whence they inferre, that to be afflicted, significth, to afflict our selues, to fast, to whip our selues, and to pay for Adversities to be said for the dead. For, whosoever (say they) afflicteth himselfe, and doth penall workes for the dead, presupposeth that there is a fire of Purgatorie. I thinke, thus saying so, they do not thinke that they shall be beleueed; and none of the ancient Fathers euer expounded this place in that manner. For although that sometimes afflictions are called a Baptisme, yet it shall neuer be found, that to be baptized, significth that a man should afflict himselfe. As also, that whosoever afflicteth himselfe for a dead man, doth not necessarily presuppose that he is in a fire. Can he not afflict himselfe, shed teares, and pray, to the end he may obtaine Gods fauour, that the dead shall rise againe to saluation? which is the end of the prayer for the dead, which is spoken of in the second booke of the Maccabees, Chapter 12. And why should he that afflicteth himselfe for a dead man, be more bound to beleue that the dead man is in a fire then in a water?

Touching the true sence of this place, I confesse that it is one of the obscure places in the Scripture whereby God exerciseth our sobrietie. Yet I will speake that which I thinke to be most probable. From *Cerinthus* came the heresie of the Cerinthians, which denied that Iesus Christ rose againe, and thereby weakened the beleife of the resurrection of the dead. This *Cerinthus* lived in the Apostles time, if we beleue *Epiphanius*, and yf we many meanes to oppose against them, and to hinder their preaching. Of these heretickes *Epiphanius* in the heresie of the Cerinthians, which is the eight faith. That when any of them dyed without Baptisme, they baptized some other man in the name of the dead person, fearing lest he should be punished at the day of the resurrection because he dyed without baptisme. Against these heretickes, who denying the resurrection of Iesus Christ, silently made the general resurrection doubtfull,

full, *Epiphanius* esteemed that *Saint Paul* in this place disputeth, and seeketh to confute them by themselves, saying, That if according to the doctrine of those false Doctors, the dead should not rise againe; how cometh it, that among them liuing men are baptized for the dead that were not baptized, to the end that the baptisme of the liuing man receiued, for and in the name of the dead man, might be profitable vnto that dead man in the resurrection? So the Apostle sheweth them that they contradict themselves. This exposition is confirmed by *Tertullian*, in the eight and fortieth Chapter of his booke of the Resurrection of the flesh; *How* (saith he) *are they baptized for the dead?* Certainly he maintaineth that they ordained this custome, grounded vpon this opinion, whereby they thought that baptisme receiued for another should be profitable to another bodie for the assurance of the Resurrection. From thence the Marcionites brought vp a custome, to put a liuing man vnder the bed wherein a dead man lay that dyed without Baptisme; and then asked the dead man, and said; Wilt thou be baptized? whereunto the liuing man hidden vnder the bed, made answer and said: *I will*; as *Chrysostome* in his fortieth Homilie vpon the first Epistle to the Corinthians saith.

Sicut & baptizantur quidam pro mortuis, videbimus an ratione; certi illa presumptione hoc eos instituisse contentis qua alij essem carnificarium baptismi profuturum existimant ad spem resurrectionis.

The place wherewith they make the greatest shew, is the 12. Chap. of *S. Matthew* 32. verse, where Iesus Christ speaking against the sinne of the holy Ghost, saith, *It shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, nor in the world to come.* The world to come (our Aduersaries say) is the fire of Purgatorie. But how is that possible? seeing that (if we may beleue it) Purgatorie was before Christ was borne? And why should that world to come rather be a fire then a water, or an ice, for there is no mention made neither of the one or the other. Besides that, how will they haue that world to come wherein sinnes are pardoned to be Purgatorie, seeing that Purgatorie is a torment and a punishment? and that (according to their doctrine) sin is already pardoned before the soules entred into Purgatorie?

The fence of this place is cleare. Not to pardon sinne, is to punish it. Then Iesus Christ declarcth that God will punish the sinne against the holy Ghost in this life, and at the day of Iudgement, which is called the other world, Luk. 20. 35. *Those that shall be counted worthy to enjoy that world, and the resurrection from the dead.*

They also alle dget. Corinthians, Chap. 3. verse 11. 12. 13. 14. 15. where Saint Paul saith, *For other foundation can no man lay then that which is layd; which is Iesus Christ. And if any man build on this foundation, gold, silver, precious stones, timber, hay, or stubble; every mans worke shall be made manifest, for the day shall declare it, because it shall be revealed by fire, and the fire shall trie every mans worke of what sort it is: If any mans worke abide which he hath builded thereupon, he shall receive wages: If any mans worke burne, he shall lose, but he shall be saved himselfe, yet so as it were by fire. Our aduersaries will haue this fire to be Purgatorie.*

I answer, first, That we can ground no doctrine vpon allegoricall places. Secondly, That seeing our Aduersaries vnderstand the words, wood, hay, stubble, or silver, allegorically, there is no reason to take the onely word *Fire* properly; specially seeing that that is the onely word whereupon the Apostle putteth the note of a similitude, saying, *He shall be saved yet as it were by fire.* Thirdly, adde hereunto, that here he speaketh of a fire which trieth the worke, and not of fire which punisheth the person. Fourthly, of a fire whereby the worke shalbe made manifest: but what is done in Purgatorie is not manifest. Fifthly, *Of every mans worke*; then of the Apostles and the Martyrs workes, whom neuertheless the Church of Rome exempts from Purgatory. Sixty, also here it is spoken of a fire wherein the worke burneth, and not soules. Seuenthy, of a fire whereby the workman loseth his worke, but in Purgatorie nothing is lost. And if men will say that sinnes therein are lost, there is a benefite in that losse.

The fence of the place is plaine. The Apostle speaketh of Pastors & Doctors which in teaching retaine the foundation, which is Iesus Christ, whereupon some build holy and firme doctrines,

doctrines, which are called gold, silver, and precious stones; other build vaine and light doctrines, which degenerate from the price and soliditie of the foundation, and are called wood, hay, and stubble. The Apostle saith, that those light doctrines, examined by the word of God as metals by fire, shall not subsist; that the worke of such a Minister shall perish; and that proofs shall manifest and make knowne; that there is no firmnesse in it. But touching the person of the Pastor, although his worke perisheth, yet he may be saued, because of the foundation which he hath holden: but yet after a triall of his worke hath bene made, as metals are tried by fire. Therefore here the Apostle speaketh of a triall that shall be made in this life, and not afterward; and of a triall of the doctrine of Pastors, and not of tormenting of soules in a fire. *d. each. iiij.*

Some make a shew of the place of Saint Paul; Philippi. 2. 10. *That at the name of Iesus every knee should bow, both of things in heauen, and things in earth, and things vnder the earth.* And of that which is said, Reuel. 5. 13. *And all the creatures which are in heauen, and on the earth, and vnder the earth, and in the sea, and all that are in them, heard I saying, Praise, and honour, and glory, and power, be vnto him that sitteth vpon the throne, and vnto the Lambe for euermore, &c.* With these places our aduersaries blow this imaginarie fire, saying, that those that are vnder the earth are the soules that are tormented in Purgatorie. They ought also to tell vs, what those creatures are which are in the sea: and also shew vs a reason why by those that are vnder the earth they will soone understand soules in Purgatory then the soules of little children that died before they were baptized, because they place them also vnder the ground. But there is much more apparence and likelihood, that by those which are vnder the earth, is vnderstood those whose bodies are in the graues, or those that are in hell: for all men both good and bad shall bow their knees before Iesus Christ at the day of iudgement, and shall humble themselves in his presence. For Saint Paul in that place to the Philippians speaketh of the kingdome given to Iesus Christ ouer all creatures without exception. As also in Rom. 14. 10, 11. where

God saith thus, *For we shall all appear before the iudgement seat of Christ: For it is written, I live (saith the Lord) and every knee shall bow to me, and all tongues shall confesse unto God.* In this place it is plaine, that the Apostle taketh *to Appear before the iudgement seat of Christ*; and to be in the knee before God; for one selfe same thing. To kindle this imaginaty fire, they yet bring a march which will not take light, that is, the 21. Chap. of the Revelation, 27. verse, where the Spirit of God speaking of the celestjall Jerusalem, saith: *And there shall enter into it no vncleane thing*; from whence they infer, that the soules of the faithfull that are spotted with sinne, ought to be purged before they enter into Paradise. But the words following shew, that by the *vncleane* is not understood the faithfull spotted with sinne, but the wicked and the abhominable. This is the whole place: *And there shall enter into it no vncleane thing; neither whatsoeuer worketh abhominacion or lies, but they which are written in the Lambs booke of life.* Then those *vncleane* are the abhominable and liars, and such are not written in the booke of life. Nor then the soules of the faithfull, which have no need to be put in the unviable paine to the fire to be purified. For the blood of Iesus Christ purgeth them from all sinne. 1. Ioh. 1. 7.

The rest of the places which they alledge have so little shew, that we thinke our adversaries are beholding unto vs for passing by them. If in the Scripture there be any speech of a boyling pot, or of the filthinesse of the daughters of Sion, or of a ditch wherein there is no water, or if it be said that God rebuketh in his wrath, they are (as they say) as many proofes of Purgatory. Covetousnesse hath made these Doctors expert in fire-Workes, and most industrious to kindle this fire. They want nothing but the word of God and common sense.

Places out of the ancient Fathers against Purgatory.

88. 3rd.

We have already heard, how diverse ancient Fathers are of opinion

opinion that the soule cannot be tormented without the body. An opinion directly against the torment of soules in Purgatory. We haue also seene how prayer for the dead practised in the ancient Church is contrarie to Purgatorie: and that the prayers for the dead which are at this day made in the Church of Rome make no mention of the fire of Purgatorie.

The booke of Questions and Answers to the Orthodoxe, which is at the end of *Iustine Martyrs* workes, saith thus in the 75. question: "After the soules are departed out of the bodies, presently a separation is made of the good from the bad, for they are carried by Angels to the places fit for them: the soules of the good into Paradise, where the Angels resort, and are conuersant; but the soules of the wicked into hell."

Saint Cyprian in his booke against *Demetrian*: "This temporal life being ended, we are sequestered into the habitation either of eternall death or of eternall life."

And in the same Treatise towards the end: "When we are gone from hence, there is no more place of repentance, nor no fruit or effect of Satisfaction. And then he addeth: If thou askest pardon of God for thy sinnes, although it be at the issuing of thy soule out of thy body, and at the end of this temporal life, pardon shall be granted vnto thee vpon repentance and confession of thy sinnes: and pardon of saluation is granted to the beleener by diuine grace and goodnesse, and from death we passe and go into life eternall."

Cyprian throughout his whole booke of Mortalitie expressly speaketh thereof, where among other things he saith, "God, at thy going out of this world, promiseth thee immortalitye and eternall life, and dost thou doubt thereof? this is not to know God at all as thou shouldest." There also he saith, that death is a passage or way to eternitie; that our brethren which are dead are not lost, but sent thither before vs; and that we must not put on blacke gownes, sith our friends haue put on

codenti eternitatem pollicetur atque eternitatem, & tu dubitas? hoc est Deum omnino non nosse. Non exitus sed transitus & temporalis timere decursus ad aeterna transgressus.

we shall go to our fathers, we shall go to the teachers of our faith, to the end, that although our works faile vs, our faith may secure vs, and the inheritance be kept for vs. Note these words, *Although our works faile vs*; that men should not thinke, but that he speaketh of the most holy, and the most perfect among men.

Epiphanius in his second booke of Heresies, in the 39. Heresie, which is the heresie of the Catharists or Nouatians, saith, *In the world to come after man is dead, there is no more helpe by fasting, no more calling for penance, no more giving of almes.* And then he addeth, *The barnes are shut up, the time is accomplished, the combat is ended; the place of the list is emptie, and the crowne are giuen.* And saith, that all this is done when the soule leaueth the body; and a little before he said, there is no more place for almes, nor for penance.

Chrysostome in the second Homilie of *Lazarus*, saith, *While we are here on earth we haue faire hopes, but as soone as we haue left this world, it is no more in our power to do penance, nor to vndo or amend that which we haue committed and done vpon earth.* And in his 75. Homilie vpon Saint *Matthew* he saith, that penance after death is vnprofitable,

And in his fourth Homilie vpon the Epistle to the Hebrewes, speaking of Hymnes and Prayers which in his time were said at burials of the dead, he saith, *What signifie these burning tapers, but that we bury the champions of Christ? and these Hymnes or songs, but that we glorifie God, and giue him thanks, because he hath crowned the dead, and deliuered him from all paine and griefe?*

And in his 32. Homilie vpon Saint *Matthew*, he chideth those which weepe for the dead, *Because* (saith he) *death is an haue of asetic.* And in the same Homilie he saith, *Is by doest thou call the poore after the death of thy friend, why doest thou desire the Priests to pray for him? Whereunto he maketh answer himselfe, and saith, That it is to the end that the dead may obtaine rest, and finde his yoke easie. Thinkest thou* (saith he) *that thou must weepe for these things? Doest*

thou

thou wilt see that therein thou dost him wrong, raising him a-
gainst him whom he is safely arrived at the haven?

Gregory Nilfen in his booke of those that Sleepe, saith, *The warre that is now being ended by death, our soules rest, leaving left the field wherein the battell was fought, that is the bodie.* And a little after: *The paines of death are as it were a midwife vnto a man, to bring him into eternal life.* The purging fire whereof he speaketh in the same booke, is the fire of the last iudgement, which (according to the opinion of the ancient Fathers) must purge all men, yea, and the virgin *Maria*, as we haue probed before. Sometimes also the Fathers call the afflictions of this life a purging fire: Saint Cyprian in the second Epistle of his fourth booke, calleth Ecclesiasticall penance imposed vpon those which by feare were become idolaters, a purgation by fire.

Saint *Augustine*, or whosoever is the author of the booke of the Vanitie of this world, in the ninth tome, Chap. x. saith, *I know, that when the soule departeth out of the body, it is presently placed in Paradise because of her good works, or is cast downe into the pit of hell because of her sinnes.* And in the margin these words are set, *Ubi nunc purgatorium?* And in the second Sermon of the Consolation of the dead, which is in the ninth tome of Saint *Augustine's* workes, cap. 1. he saith: *The soule going out of the body is receiued by the Angels, and placed in Abraham's bosome if it be faithfull, or in the infernall prison of hell if it be sinfull.*

In the eighteenth Sermon of the words of the Apostle he saith, *There are two habitations; the one in the eternall kingdome of heauen, the other in the eternall fire of hell.*

And in the 23. Sermon which is against Drunkenesse, he saith, *Let no man decriue himselfe any bytreuen, for there are two places, and no third place. He that shall not merite to reigne with Christ in heauen, without doubt shall perishe with the diuill in hell.*

In the booke of the Desert of sinnes, and of pardon thereof,

o Per mortem
soluto holo,
quid in nobis
est, post mortem
agitas, Postea
quam dolor
mortis ad al-
teram vitam
hominibus
quasi obstru-
cata fuerit.
p. Aug lib 21.
de ciuitate
Dei, cap 13.
Nec in hoc
mortalis vita
esse quoddam
purgatorium
paruas confite-
mur.
q. Scitote quod
cum anima a
corpore emul-
sur, aut in Pa-
radiso pro ui-
ritu bonis col-
locatur, aut
certe pro pec-
catis in inferni
tortura precipi-
tatur.
i. Recedunt au-
tem ab Angelis
suspiciunt, &
collocatur aut
in sinu Abra-
he fidelis est,
aut in carcere
aut in carcere
dile si pecca-
trix est.
f. Quae sunt habitationes, una in igne aeterno, altera in regno aeterno. i. Nemo se decipiat, fratres,
duo enim loca sunt & certius non est illud. Qui cum Christo regnare non miratur, cum diabolo
absque dubitatione idem peribit.

cap. 18. He saith, *There is no middle way, in such manner that he which dwelleth not with Iesus Christ, must dwell elsewhere with the diuill.* And it is to be noted, that Saint *Augustine* in this place maintaineth, that little children which are not baptized, are in hell. Certainly he would not haue bene so hard and rigorous against those children, if he had knowne of any other place of punishment, which is not so rigorous, or shorter, as *Limbū patrum*, or *Purgatorie*.

These places in this Father ought to be taken for a resolution of a doubt which he sometimes had, whether after this life there is any temporall torment and purging fire. And in his *Manuell to Laurentius*, cap. 68. he saith, That that fire which proueth euery mans worke, whereof Saint *Paul*, 1. Cor. 3. 11. speaketh, is the triall of afflictions which is made in this life. And proceeding in that matter in the Chapter following he saith, *It is not a thing incredible that such a thing may happen after this life, and we may doubt whether it be such as may be found, or whether it be an hidden thing, that certayne faithfull persons shall be saved by purging fire, some sooner some later, as they loued and affected the things of this world.* He doubteth whether he should beleue this purgation by fire, which many ancient Fathers referred to the day of iudgement.

And in the booke of the eight Questions propounded by *Dulsius*, in the first question he saith, *Whether men suffer afflictions onely in this life, or whether after this life some such punishments ensue, is it not a thing, as I thinke, farre from the appearance of truth.*

In the 26. Chapter of the one and twentieth booke of the Cite of God, he saith of transitory tribulation after this life, *Non redarguo quia forsitan verum est, I denie it not, because it may be it is true.*

We haue also scene before two formall places out of the booke of the Cite of God, wherein he putteth this purgation to be at the day of iudgement: but in the 21. booke and 16. Chapter he is of a contrarie minde, and saith, *That we must beleue that there are no purging paines but those that are before the latter iudgement.* Which makes me beleue that this

this place hath bene corrupted or thrust into his booke by malice; and that it is not credible, that this Doctor who in so many other places affirmeth the contrarie, should be so forgetfull, and that in one selfe same booke he should contradict him selfe; or that by purging paines he vnderstandeth the afflictions of this life.

We will end this question with an expresse sentence out of Pope Gregorie the first in his 13. booke vpon Iob, cap. 20. where he saith, *"Because we are redeemed by the grace of our Creator, we haue this heavenly gift; that when our soules depart out of this fleshy habitation, we are presently carried to the reward of eternall rest. I know not what may be spoken to this purpose more expressly."*

Of Indulgences or Pardons.

89. *Ser.*

The fire of Purgatory being in this manner quenched, Indulgences or Pardons whereby the Pope draweth soules out of this fire, grow cold. In such manner, that the Pope hath no need to heape vp and gather the superabundant satisfactions of Saints into his treasure, to distribute them by his pardons, and to conuert them into payment or satisfaction for others, and thereby to draw soules out of Purgatorie. This businesse is altogether superfluous.

For he shall not need to trouble himselfe to take that out of prison which is not there. And though it were so, yet the afflictions and troubles of the Saints whom God hath sufficiently rewarded in their owne persons, would not be an acceptable satisfaction. For the Scripture saith, Gal. 6. 5. *That euery man shall beare his owne burthen.* And 1. Cor. 3. 8. *Euery man shall receiue his wages according to his labour.* And 2. Cor. 5. 10. *Euery man shall receiue the things which are done in his body, whether it be good or euill.* And Psal. 49. 7. *No man can by any means redeeme his brother, nor giue to God a ransom for him.*

As

As also that the satisfaction of Iesus Christ is sufficient, without borrowing the afflictions of the Saints, or the fastings, pilgrimages, and whippings of Monkes, 1. Iohn 1. 7. *The blood of our Lord Iesus Christ cleanseth us from all sinne*: and Acts 4. 12. *There is no saluation in any other*. He giueth no vertue to the Saints to pay a debt which is discharged, nor to make satisfaction for that for the which he himselve hath fully satisfied. It is a mocking of the Saints, to set them on worke to do a thing which is done before.

If the Pope were bound to yeeld an account of his actions, and to shew by what authoritie he doth that which he doth, could he shew in what place God hath giuen him that power to take soules out of Purgatory? Secondly, who hath commanded him to heape vp the superabundant satisfactions of Saints and Monkes in his treasure? Thirdly, where and when God did first command him to distribute the to others? I beleeue he would be hardly bestead: seeing that the high Priests in the old Testament did not gather together the superabundant satisfactions of *Noe* nor of *Abraham*, nor made any distribution of them: nor neuer thought of taking any soules out of Purgatory, either by power of Iurisdiction, or any manner of suffrages. Seeing also, that neither Iesus Christ, nor the Apostles, nor yet the ancient Church for many yeares euer spake of this treasure, nor did by Pardons distribute the ouerplus of humane satisfactions, nor established priuiledged altars, nor tooke any soules out of Purgatorie. And *Gabriel Biel* in his 57. Lecture vpon the Canon of the Masse, and Cardinall *Caietan* in the beginning of the booke of Indulgences, acknowledge, That in all antiquity there is nothing found touching Pardons.

The abuse thereof is most euident and cleare, in this, that the remission of sinnes is tyed to a certaine Church, in such manner that he which should elsewhere do three times as many deuotions should not haue the same pardon. And in this, that when the day of Iubilie is at Rome, those that are neare thereunto haue their remission at their ease; but those which are three hundred leagues from thence, and want money,

ney, or a good horse, or a good paire of legs, are deprived of that spirituall liberalitie. And herein, that the Pope giueth full pardon of all finnes, and a third part of finnes besides, that is to say, that he forgines all their finnes, and many other. As also herein, that the Pope and the Clergie draw great profits, and vse a great trafficke thereby. The Iubiley is the great harvest of the Citle of Rome: then offerings and treasure come thither from all places. And in this, that the Pope giueth pardons without any exact calculation, (as having secretly reckoned with God) giuing eightene thousand yeares of pardon, and as many times forty dayes, and some dayes more: there wanted nothing but houres and minutes. And in this, that he throwes pardons abroad like a handfull of crownes among the prease, as when he throwes a thousand yeares of pardon among the prease of the people vpon the day of his Coronation.

But specially and aboue all, it is an admirable thing, that Iesus Christ mediateth and intreateth for the soules that are in Purgatory, and that they come not forth from thence by his intercession, but come out by the Popes pardons. Which can neither be blanchied nor excused by that which some say, that the intercession of Iesus Christ doth not exempt the faithfull from sicknesses and other afflictions in this present life. For the intercession of Iesus Christ serueth not to hurt vs: but it should be hurtfull vnto vs, if it deprived vs of the wholsome remedies which God vseth to amend vs, which are sicknesses and afflictions. In which ranke Purgatory is not to be reckoned, which serueth not to amend and instruct sinners, and to keepe them in the feare of God. We cannot say, that it should be an hurtfull thing to those soules not to be burnt, and to be presently carried into Paradise. Christs satisfaction exempteth vs from satisfying, but depriveth vs not of corrections and wholsome trials. And the Pope doth not by his pardons exempt men from sicknesses, but will haue them so beleene that he drawes soules out of Purgatory. Wherein he manifestly exalts himselfe aboue Gods: for if it be Gods will to punish his children in a fire, why will not the Pope suffice,

suffer him to punish them as it pleaseth him? Aske him by what authoritie he doth that, and he will say, That God gaue *Peter* the power to vnbinde and loose vpon earth. Put the case that this were likewise said of the Pope, yet that place speaketh not of loosing vnder the earth, the power of the Keyes extendeth not to the dead.

*Of Single life, or perpetuall abstinence
from marriage.*

To beginne this question, we declare and auouch, that we honour and much esteeme constant virginitie, and acknowledge that it hath many aduantages aboue marriage: and that a man which is not married, if he be chaste and continent, is the fitter to beare the crosse of Christ, and to resolue with himselfe to endure banishment for the word of God. For he is lesse tied and combred with humane cares, and hath more libertie. His mind is lesse distracted by the cares of this present life: and he hath more time to employ himselfe in the seruice of God.

But these praises and commendations belong onely to continent and constant virginitie, which is not onely an integritie of the bodie, but also a puritie of spirit, voyd of all concupiscence. Which is a gift that happeneth to a very few men, and may as well be giuen to a Lay man as to a Pastor of the Church.

This commendation of Virginitie ought not in any sort to preiudice Marriage, ordained by God in Paradise, and which Iesus Christ would honour with his presence: who also would be borne of a virgin, but yet contracted, and vnder shadow of marriage, to honour virginitie without dishonouring marriage, instituted by God to be a remedie against incontinencie, an ease of afflictions, a mutuall support, a meanes of the conseruation of humane kinde, and by consequence of the Church.

Against this marriage the Popes haue banded themselves,

and

90. Self.

*Hieron. lib. 1.
cont. Iovinian.
Illa virginitas
habet quod
Christo, cuius
nec mensura
cogitatio, nec
carnem libido
maculauit.
Ambrosius de
virginib. Regn.
sola carnis
virginem sa-
tis sed uirginis
mentis castitas
gratia.*

A Can. Pro-
fissi. Nec
us ad sacra
officia sui sit
admittens,
qui currens
cum uxoribus
carnale con-
sortium, quia
scripsimus est,
Sancti estote
quoniam ego
sanctus sum.
b Can. Pluri-
mos.

c Quisquis
ille est secta-
tur libidinum,
præceptor vi-
tiorum, Epi-
scopus, Aucto-
ratus,
dux, in hoc sa-
culo non
ignominia-
bitur.
d Episcopus
potest proce-
dere contra
quoscumque ob
procurum non
talis, nisi assen-
sue permisso
fuerit, ut mo-
stratum.

e Extra. De
Bigamia, cap.
Quatuor.
Pastores per
salem Apo-
stolicam edoceri, si presbyteri plures concubinas habentes bigami consensur. Ad quod duximus
respondendum, quod cum irregularitatem non incurritur bigamia, cum in tantum simpliciter
fornicationis reus, quod ad consecrationem sacerdotatus officij poterit dispensare.

and haue inuented a thousand meanes to make it odious. Pope Innocent in Distinction 8^a, forbids those that dwell carnally with their wives to be received into any sacred offices, because it is written, *Be ye holy, for I am holy*: as if holinesse were disagreeing with marriage; or as if the commandement to be holy, belonged onely to Ecclesiasticall persons. There also he groundeth single life vpon this place of Scripture, Titus 1. 15. which saith, *Vnto the pure all things are pure, but vnto them that are defiled and unbelseruing nothing is pure*. And vpon that which is said, Rom. 8. 8. 9. *Those that are in the flesh cannot please God*.

Pope Syricus in the same Distinction speaketh thus, ^b *We vnderstand that diuers Priests and Deacons long time since their consecrations haue begotten children, not onely in marriage, but in adulterie*. And a little while after, he calleth both the one and the other ^c *Ringleaders of adulterie, and teachers of vices*. Which the Apostle to the Hebrews did not beleeue, when in the 13. Chapter, verse 4. he calleth marriage, *The bed undefiled*. Nor Epiphanius when he said, that *Enoch* was not a virgin, and yet he was continent.

Bellarmino in cap. 34. of the booke of Monks, calls the marriage of Monks a Sacriledge, and saith, it is a greater sin then adultery for them to marry. And yet they are not abashed to see a Priest keep a whore. In Rome the Priests and Prelates go publicly to the Stewes. But if any of them marrie, he is esteemed a monster, and I thinke that he should not scape the Inquisition. So the Popes forbid marriage, and permit adulterie. The Iesuite Emmanuel Sa in his Aphorismes, at the word ^d *Bishop*, maketh no difficulty to say, that whore-hunting is by right permitted vnto them.

And although that in the Church of Rome those that are Bigamies are irregular, that is, that those that haue bene twise married are not admitted to the Priesthood; yet he is not irregular that hath had diuers concubines, ^e as Pope

Innocent

Innocent the third declareth. All that is done for feare lest married priests should diminish the goods of the Church to giue them to their children, as *Pope Gregorie* the first saith in the 18. Distinction. By the like policie where any profit may be procured to the Popes and Prelates, they haue advanced the dignitie of marriage, placing it amongst the number of the Sacraments of the Church, thereby to draw the knowledge of matrimoniall causes to themselves; vnder pretence that it belongs to the Church to take knowledge of the Sacraments. And yet forgetting themselves, they marrie some by deputies, which they would find to be absurd in the other Sacraments, and would not suffer any one to be baptized for another.

*Can. de Sy-
racusana. Su-
perstet uxor
aut filij per
quos Ecclesia-
stica solas po-
riclitaris sub-
stantia.*

By the same policy they haue forbidden marriage in the third and fourth degree, and forged forbidden degrees of spirituall parentage; because, the more prohibitions that are made, men come the oftener vnto them for Dispensations.

1 Touching this question, if we take the word of God for Iudge herein, the difference will soone be ended. For the chiefe Doctors of the Church of Rome confesse, that we haue no commandement from God touching the same. *Thomas* 2. 2. *Quaest. 88.* *Art. 11.* and after him *Bellarmino*, in the first booke of Clerkes, chap. 18. teach, that the prohibition made to spirituall persons not to marrie, is no diuine law, but a humane and positiue law; and neuerthelesse we haue heard before, and experience witnesseth the same, that this humane commandement is inuolubly obserued, but that adulterie is permitted; and the Stewes established in Rome by the Popes permission, contrary to the commandement of God.

2 The Apostle, 1. Cor. 7. 31. saith, *To auoid fornication let every man haue his wife, and every woman haue her owne husband.* Note, *every man*: to the end that spirituall persons should not be exempted. And, *to auoid fornication*. Then this commandement is made to spirituall persons subiect to fornication.

3 In the same Chapter verse 9. it is said; *But if they cannot abstaine, let them marrie, for it is better to marrie then to burne.*

Iuror. An vnchaste priest then that hath not the gift of continencie is bound to marrie. It serues not his turne to say, that he hath made a vow not to marrie, and that he must obserue and keepe his vow. For the same priest hath also made a vow not to commit adulterie: and although he had not made that vow, yet he is bound thereunto, seeing that God in his Law forbiddeth adulterie. Now, which promise is most strictly to be obserued, either that which a man maketh to God to obserue and obey his commandements, or that which he maketh to the Church, without the commandement of God? Which bond or obligation is the strongest, either that which a man oweth to God whether he will or not, or that wherein we willingly binde our selues, without any necessitie, and without the word of God? How comes it to passe then that the marriage of a Priest contrary to an vnneccessarie vow is called sacriledge, but if he committeth adulterie against the commandement of God, the fault is esteemed a thousand times lesse? I say, that adulterie committed by a priest, not onely breaketh his vow made to God to obey his Law, but also infringeth the vow of chastitie that he made when he was made a priest, so that he breaketh two vowes. But if he marrie he breakes but one, and that was made contrary to the word of God. So adultery committed by a priest is a double sacriledge, because therby two vowes are broken.

4. If all men be bound, and that without a vow, to obey God, then priests are bound to obey the commandement of God pronounced by the Apostle, *If they cannot abstaine, let them marrie.* Holy, iust, and necessarie obligations to saluation, cannot be broken by necessarie subsequent vowes.

5. Hereunto I adde, that it is an abuse here to alledge the vow not to marrie. For vowes are good, first, if we vow good things: secondly, if we vow willingly and with knowledge what we do: thirdly, if we vow things which are in our power to do. Now in this vow not to marry, there wanteth these three things. First, for that a man that is not continent, voweth neuer to marrie, that is to say, that he will vow to disobey God, that will haue persons that haue not the gift of conti-

continencie to marrie. Feeling himselfe not able to containe, he will vow to abstaine from the remedie of incontinencie which God hath ordained. This vow being contrary to Gods will; is of no force, and yet he is constrained to keepe his vow, although he should commit adultery a thousand times.

6 Secondly, this vow also is ordinarily made unwillingly, and without knowing what it is. Men make their daughters Nunnes at twelue yeares, and their sonnes Monkes at fourteene yeares of age, then when they do not know what concupiscence meaneth: which after beginning to kindle in them, worketh with double force, like cinders that are covered ouer with ashes, and at the last breake out violently into a flame. A father to discharge himselfe of his dutie towards his children, putteth the weakest and imperfectest of them into an house of religion, and offereth the maimed and lame vnto God. And those poore children entring joyfully into the Fishers weeles, sonne after, at their leisure, sigh and grone in their captiuitie.

7 Lastly, by this vow men promise things which are not in their power: for chastitie is a gift which God bestoweth not vpon many men. The vnchaste life of the most part of those that make this vow, sufficiently sheweth it. To quench naturall affections, we must haue a supernaturall gift, which is not in our power. The Apostle 1. Cor. 7. 7. feeling himselfe to be exempted from these desires, said, *I would that all men were euen as I my selfe am.* But to shew that few haue that gift, he addeth. *But every man hath his proper gift of God, one after this manner, another after that.*

8 Whereupon Bellarmine confesseth; that this gift is not in our power; yet, that every man may aske the same of God. But he considereth not that God will not heare our prayers if they be nor made in faith, as Saint Iames saith; 1. 6. 7. and also that this faith is a gift of God, Ephesians 3. which gift God giueth not to all men; 2. Thes. 3. 2. As also that he which asketh grace of God not to marrie, hath no promise that God will heare him. It is true that God promiseth to giue vs all things that we shall aske in the name of Iesus Christ: but

Lib. 2. de Monac. cap. 31.

disput. 26

R 2

he

he speaketh of things necessarie to saluation, of which number perpetuall virginitie is none. And God gaue not that gift to those men whom he loued most, as to *Moses*, to *Samuel*, to *David*, to *Ezra*, &c. But, how should the Priests and Clerkes of the Church of Rome be assured to obtaine the gift of chastitie, which is not necessarie to saluation, and which God hath not promised, seeing that they make profession not to be assured by prayer to obtaine the saluation which God promiseth? In vowing chastitie then they vow that which God hath not promised them, and which they are not assured to obtaine, and which is not in their power. Whence it followeth, that this vow is rashly made, and by consequence is not to be obserued.

¶ 9. Also, we haue examples of the Prophets extraordinarily and miraculously inspired, and indued with the Spirit of God; as *Moses*, *Samuel*, *Ezra*, &c. which were married and had children. The priests also in the old Law were married; and that in such a time, when in externall things, and in cleanness and ceremoniall exactnesse, God required a greater puritie then he doth vnder the Gospell. And if marriage had bene vsuall for the priests in the old Law, God would haue ordained some other meanes to continue the order of priests then by succession from the father to the sonne. To this they make no answer: for that which they say is no answer. They say that the priests abstained from their wives in the time of their service. A thing inuented by themselves, and which cannot be proued. But on the contrary it is found that *Aaron* and his sonnes were daily both morning and evening to attend vpon the sacrifice; and to burne incense euery morning, Exodus 30. 7. as also, that the ordinarie food of the high Priest and of his familie, was that portion of the sacrifices which was allotted vnto them.

¶ 10. Nevertheless, put case that it were so; can abstinence for a few dayes serue, or be sufficient to establish perpetuall virginie? For such an abstinence did not deprive the priests of the end and intent of marriage, which is to beget children, and to prevent inconueniencie: but perpetuall single life depriveth

deprineth a man of those things, intangleth him in wicked desires, and resisteth nature. Which serueth also for an answer to the like allegations. As is the prohibitio made to the Israelites not to touch their wiues carnally for the space of three dayes before the publication of the Law. And that which the Apostle 1. Corint. 7.5. saith, *Defraud not one another, except it be with consent for a time, that you may give your selues to fasting and prayer, and againe come together, that Satan tempt you not for your incontinencie.*

11 Many of the Apostles also were married. In the first of Marke 30. mention is made of *Peters* wiues mother. *Ignatius* liuing neare to the Apostles time, in his Epistle to the Philadelphians, saith, *a Peter and Paul, and the rest of the Apostles were married.* Saint *Ambrose* vpon the 11. Chapter of the 2. Corinthians saith, *b All the Apostles except Iohn and Paul, had wiues.* *Clement Alexandrinus* in his third of Strom. saith, *c Do they reiect the Apostles? For Peter and Philip begat children. Philip gaue his daughters to husbands. And Paul made no difficultie in one of his Epistles, to speake to his companion, being a woman.* Which I alledge, not that I beleue that Saint *Paul* was married, but to shew that *Clement* did not esteeme marriage to be incompatible with the Apostles office. In the 21. Chapter of the Acts, verse 9. it is said, that *Philip* the Euangelist had foure daughters. *Platina* in the life of *Cletus* the first saith, that Saint *Luke* was married, and that his wife was in Bithynia.

12 Our Aduersaries answer, and say, that it is true, that those holy seruants of God had wiues, but that they lay not with them, and had not the carnall vse of their bodies. These men diuine what they list, without producing any prohibition made to the Apostles touching the same. What would the Apostles haue thought, when Iesus Christ called them, if he had layd that necessitie vpon them to abstaine from their wiues? Who doubts that the high Priests and the Pharisees that sifted him so narrowly, would not haue persecuted him therefore, as hauing imposed a yoke vpon them which God had not set downe in his Law? *Defraud not one another, saith*

a ος πῆρε τὴν γυναῖκα, καὶ ἦν ὁ ἀλλοτρίος ἀποστόλος καὶ ἡ γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ. b Omnes Apostoli excepto Ioanne et Paulo uxores habuerunt. c ἡ δὲ ἀποστολή καταδύναμις αὐτοῦ ὡς καὶ ἐν τῇ ἐπιστολῇ αὐτοῦ καταδείκνυται. &c.

the Apostles, but come together againe, 1. Cor. 6. 5. If to defraud one another be a vice in other men, why had it bene a vertue in the Apostles?

13 It is true that the Apostles said to Iesus Christ, Math. 19. 27. *We haue forsaken all and followed thee*: To whom Iesus Christ made answer and said, verse 19. *Whosoever shall forsake house, or bretheren, or sisters, or father, or mother, or wife, or children, or lands, for my names sake, he shall receiue an hundred fold more, and shall inherit eternall life.* But it is a great abuse, to take that which he saith to all the faithfull, as if it were onely said to the Apostles and Pastors of the Church. For he saith, *Whosoever shall forsake, &c.* All the faithfull ought to forsake houses, fields, wiues, children, fathers, mothers, yea and their owne liues, when they cannot keepe them but by denying Iesus Christ, or forsaking that vocation whereunto God hath called them. In that case God will haue all humane bands broken, and that all naturall affections shall in a manner be choked by the zeale and the desire to saue our soules, and to follow our vocation. Saint *Augustine* in his 89. Epistle expoundeth that place in this manner, saying: *Sometime there happeneth such a necessitie, that we must either leaue our wiues, or Iesus Christ.* The place is long, and very expresse to this purpose, and he speaketh of all the faithfull.

14 It is to be noted also, that Iesus Christ there speakes of forsaking wiues, children, houses, and goods generally. Then seeing the Church of Rome doth iudge that by this place Priests and Bishops are not bound to forsake and leaue the vse of their goods, why should they by the same place be bound to leaue the vse of their wiues? If a father that is become a Priest, is not bound by this place to be no more a father, why should he by this place be bound to be no more an husband? If he may keepe his goods, why should he not also keepe his wife? for these two things are also ioynly set downe in this place. And we see by the History of the Gospell, that after Iesus Christ had said that to his Apostles, they did not leaue the propriety and vse of their sister boates, nor Saint *Iohn* of his.

his house, whereinto he receiued the virgine *Mario* after the death of Christ our Lord.

15 To be short, touching this matter we haue the expresse prohibition of our Lord Iesus Christ saying to his Apostles, *Matthew 19. 9. No man shall put away his wife, except it be for whoredome, &c.* And verse 6. *The man and his wife are no more twaine, but one flesh. Let no man therefore put asunder that which God hath coupled together.* Seeing that the Lord spake to his disciples in that place, with what shew can they except them onely from the obedience of that commandement? And if they must haue abstained from their wiues, would they haue kept them with them? this could not haue bene without offence. Whither would they haue driven them away, and separated them from their children, but there would haue bene inhumanitie and a publike scandale?

16 The Apostle Saint *Paul* in the first to *Tim.* 4. 1. 2. 3. saith, *In the latter times some shall depart from the faith, and shall giue heed vnto spirits of error and doctrine of diuels: Which speake lies through hypocrisie, and haue their consciences burnt with an hot iron, forbidding to marrie, &c.*

To shun this place, they say, that the Apostle speaketh against other heretickes, which condemned marriage as a wicked and filthy thing in it selfe.

Whereunto I answer, that there is no prohibition in the word of God which a man may not shift off by the same meanes. So theeeues may dispence with the Law, which saith, *Thou shalt not steale*, by saying, that that is spoken against those that steale without necessitie, or that steale from their friends, but not to those that steale for need, or that rob a stranger. So adulterie may be permitted, by saying that God forbiddeth women to haue to do with many men; but not to haue a friend in a corner. The Apostles words are generall, and without exception condemne those Doctors which forbid marriage. When the King by his proclamation maketh a generall prohibition, doth it belong to the subiect to make exceptions and restraints vpon the same, which are not contained in the Proclamation? and without hauing any warrant or de-

claration of the Kings will touching the same? Whosoever brings any exceptions or restraints against a generall commandement of God, made vnto vs in his word, ought to draw and take his exceptions out of the word of God. If it be euill to condemne marriage as a filthy vncleane thing, it is not much lesse to condemne it by tyrannie and by superstition. We may run into one selfesame danger by diuerse meanes: one selfesame error may enter and be grounded in mens minds by diuerse and seuerall reasons. And I see not how those which condemne marriage as being a filthy vncleane thing, can speake of marriage in more odious termes then the Popes *Syricius* and *Innocent* aforesaid do, which call it a vice, and an impuritie and vncleannesse, and esteeme it to be contrary to holinesse.

17 The same Apostle in the 1. Tim. 3. 2. saith, *A Bishop must be vncorruptible; the husband of one wife, one that can rule his owne house honestly, having children vnder obedience with all honestie: for if any cannot rule his owne house, how shall he take care of the Church of God?* And in the 12. verse, *Let the Deacons be the husbands of one wife: and verse 11. Likewise their wives must be honest, not euill speakers, &c.*

To contend and strue about that, is not to dispute against vs, but to giue the Apostle *Saint Paul* the lie, vnder a colour of interpreting his words. For you must note, that he saith not, that the Bishop *hath bene*, but that he *must be* the husband one wife. For if the Apostle had vnderstood that a Bishop had bene the husband of one wife, we must by the same reason say, that *Saint Paul* will haue a Bishop to haue bene, but not that he should be, without reproofe. By this meanes the Bishopricke shall be an entry into vice, and an exemption from doing good.

Againe the Apostle ordaineth, that their wiues shall be honest, sober, and faithfull: he speaketh then of Bishops and Deacons which haue wiues, and not of those that haue none as being dead. For the Apostle instructeth not dead women, but instructeth Bishops wiues, lest that by their vices they should dishonour their husbands vocation. Pope *Leo* the first,

in.

in his 85. Epistle vnderstood it so: saying. *The Apostle saith, that we must chuse a Bishop that hath bene, or that is, the husband of one wife.*

Not that the Apostle esteemeth or placeth marriage to be one of the vertues in a Bishop, or that he forbiddeth a man vnlesse he be married to be made a Bishop. The Apostle onely forbiddeth a Bishop to haue two wiues, for that as then polygamy or the hauing of many wiues together was vsed among the Iewes, as *Iosephus* in the 17 booke of his Antiquities, chap. 1. witnesseth, saying: *It is the manner of our country to haue many wiues together; and then Herod had nine wiues.* Saint *Hierome* to *Oecumenus* saith the same. *Theodorēt* vpon this place saith the same both of the Greekes and the Iewes. Looke also in *Chrysostome* in his 10. Homilie vpon the 1. to *Timothie*.

A man may haue two wiues two wayes, either by keeping two wiues in his house together, or else by putting away his lawfull wife without any cause of adulterie, and marrying with another. For *Iesus Christ* in *Mathew* 19.9. declareth, that marriage cannot lawfully be dissolued, vnlesse it be for a dultery. In this latter manner a woman may haue two husbands, if she haue left her first husband, or if she hath bene put away without committing adulterie, and is married to another husband. A thing which was common, as Saint *Augustine* in his 89. Epistle, Question 4. declareth. Saint *Hierome* in his Epistle to *Oecumenus* saith, That *Fabiola* forsooke her husband. Of which women that loued to change, *Seneca* in the third booke of *Benefits*, chap. 16. saith, ^a That they reckoned their yeares, not by the Consuls, but by the number of their husbands. *Cicero* ^b in the eight booke of his familiar Epistles, Epistle 7. speaketh of *Triarius* sister, who without cause made a diuorce with her husband. As also the *Procleia* of *Martial*:

—*Veterem Procleia maritum*

Deseris atque inbes ves sibi habere suus.

Such were the women which the Apostle 1. Tim. 5.9. excludeth from hauing any charge of ministring in the Church,

saying.

Dicente Apo-
stolo vt Epis-
copus ordina-
tur quē vnū
virum
fuisse aut esse
constituit.

παιδείαν ἡ δὲ ἐ-
κείνη πλείους
ἡγάγετο γυναί-
κας, ἡρώδης ὁ
βασιλεὺς ἔσχετο
ἑπτὰ τῶν ἡγε-
νῶν τοῦ ἔθνους
ἐκείνου.

a Illustres
quadam ac
nobiles fami-
nae, non consu-
lum numero
sed maritorū
annos suos
computant: Et
excent matri-
monij causa
nubunt repu-
diij.

b Soror Tri-
arij diuortium
sine causa fe-
cit, nuptura est
Decio Bruto.
c Vide Sita-
tum Senensium
lib. 6. in expo-
sitione 1. Cap-
ituli ad Titum.
Annot. 318.
p. 325.

saying, Let not a widow be taken into the number under 60. years old, and that hath bene the wife of one husband. That is to say, that hath not had two husbands together, the one dwelling with her, the other separated by diuorce, whether she sought a diuorce with the first, or whether her husband put her away for adulterie. For you must not beleue that the Apostle excludeth a widow from ministering in the Church, that hath married againe to another husband after the death of her first husband, seeing that in the same Chapter he commandeth yong widowes to marrie againe. For else he should command them to do a thing which would make them vnworthy to minister in the Church. Whereupon I cannot but be much abashed at a Romish Decree, wherein they permit a Canon to be extant, which saith, that the Apostle spake both against reason and truth, and that by commanding to marrie againe, he permitte fornication. It is the 31. Cause in the first Distinction, *Hac ratio.* The words are these. *By this meanes also the Apostle commanded to marrie againe, because of the incontinence of men. For according to the Apostles commandment, it is permitted to take a second wife, but according to the reason of truth, it is mere adultery. But seeing God permitting it, it is done publicly and by licence, be committeth an honest adultery.* Some being not able to auoyd the force of this so cleare and expresse a place of the Apostle, confesse that then Bishops were married: but that they were constrained to chuse such Bishops, because as then they could not find a sufficient number of men that were not married to gouerne the Church.

To say so, is to weaken the power of Iesus Christ. For it is certaine, that it was not by constraint, nor for want of other meanes, that he chose his Apostles which were married men, namely Saint Peter, seeing he had the hearts of all men in his power, and could inuest the most incapable persons with sufficient graces to that end. And if at this day those onely which are endued with the gift of continence were admitted into the priesthood, would there, thinke you, be a sufficient number found to fill the places that are voyd?

a *Hac ratio-
ne Apostoli
præceperunt
secundas adire
nuptias, prop-
ter incontinen-
tiam hominum.
Nō secundum
quidem accipe-
re secundum
præceptum A-
postoli licitum
est: secundum
autē veritatis
rationem verē
fornicatio est.
Sed cum per-
mittente Deo
public & li-
ceter com-
mittitur, sit
innocēse forni-
catio,
b The Iesuite
Baile Quest.
23. of his Ca-
techisme.*

18 The Apostle Saint Paul, 1. Cor. 9. 5. saith thus, *Have we not power to leade about a wife being a sister, as well as the rest of the Apostles, and as the brethren of the Lord, and Cephas?*

Bellarmino after others saith, that Saint Paul by a wife that is a sister, vnderstandeth not a wife which is ioyned vnto a man by marriage, but a wife to serue them necessarily in the way, and to supply their wants. Such as the women were that followed Iesus Christ, who hauing bene healed by him, did minister to him of their substance, Luke 8. 2, 3.

But Pope Leo IX. (who by the prerogative of his seate hath the gift not to erre) in the 31 Distinction of the Canon *Omnino*, declareth, that by a wife that is a sister, is vnderstood a wife married to an Apostle, from whose carnall company neuertheless he abstained, although he tooke her with him. And the glosse of the Doctors thereupon saith, *Ducebant uxores secum ut seruirent eis in cibis parandis*: They tooke their wiues with them, to serue to dresse their meate. And *Tertullian*, although he were a Montanist, and an enemy to marriage, in his eight chapter of the booke of Chastitie, saith thus against himselfe: *Licetbat & Apostoli nubere, & uxores circumducere: licetbat & de Euangelio viuere*. It was permitted to the Apostles to marrie, and leade their wiues about with them, and to liue of the Gospell.

Reason it selfe without any other prooffe ouerthroweth *Bellarmines* exposition. For such women could not haue followed the Apostles honestly and without suspition. Those women that followed Iesus Christ might do it without abandoning or leauing their families: for the way which they went was short, and not about 30 leagues, which is the distance from Galilie to Ierusalem, whereunto Iesus Christ went to the solemne feast. But to go out of their countrie, to passe ouer the seas, to go a thousand or twelue hundred leagues with the Apostles, was a thing which an honest woman neither could nor ought to do: and which naturall affection towards her familie would not haue permitted. They would rather haue paid the charges of some seruants to haue followed the Apostles in their iournies.

Omnino confitemur non licere Episcopo uxorem habere à cura sua. Sed ut ei vicium & vestitum largiatur, sed non vt cum ea carnaliter ex more iaceat. Sicut sanctos Apostolos legitimus egisse, beato Apostolo dicentes: Nunquid non habemus potestatem mulierem fornicem circumducendi?

The

The Apostles words take away all difficultie: for such women would haue followed the Apostles by charitie, and not by any power which the Apostles had ouer them: for the Apostle saith, *Have I not power to leade about a wife being a sister?* He would rather haue said in the plurall number: *Have I not power to leade about women being sisters?* For such duties of charitie and domesticall seruices are more easily and honestly performed by diuers women.

19 Among many meane objections of our aduersaries, I see but one that hath any shew or colour. The Apostle, 1. Tim. 5. 11. 12. saith, *But refuse the younger widowes: for when they haue begun to wax wanton against Christ, they will marrie, hauing damnation, because they haue broken their first faith.* In this place the Apostle speaks of certaine widowes which then tooke the charge vpon them of ministracion or being seruants to the Church, to releue the sicke, and to succour the poore. Those women entring into that charge voluntarily, promised to end their dayes in that holy seruice. But it fell out so, that some of them altered their purpose, either by becoming harlots and wanton against Christ, (as the Apostle saith) or else by marrying againe. Whereby being vnder the power of an husband, they had no more libertie to continue in that charge which they had taken vpon them in the Church. For which cause the Apostle saith, that they are to be condemned or reprobued for hauing violated that faith and promise which they had made to the Church, to perseuere in the seruice of the poore and sicke persons. Which to preuent, the Apostle forbiddeth yong women to make such promises as might hinder them from marrying, and will haue *yong widowes to marrie and bring forth children*, verse 14. And forbiddeth to receiue or admit any widow into the administration of the Church, which is lesse then 60 yeares old, verse 9. at which time the vow of not marrying would be ridiculous. So that this place being well vnderstood, is contrary to the vow of not marrying, seeing that he forbiddeth yong widowes to do it, and will haue none but old women of 60 yeares of age and not vnder, to be receiued into a charge

charge which disagreeeth with marriage. Which is farre from prohibiting notorious incontinent Clerkes from marriage, as at this day they do.

I need not aggravate the filthinesse of their constrained single life, nor the vices as well naturall as contrary to nature which thereby haue crept in among those that make profession thereof. The same Prelates which preach continencie, live incontinently. As they live, so they dispute against nature, and burning in wicked and euill desires, make a promise to God not to vse those remedies against them which he ordaineth in his word. The Pope which forbiddeth Priests to marrie, for a recompence hath opened the stiewes for them, and by order and publicke authoritie hath permitted fornication. Which drew this true confession from Pope Pius the second, that for great causes Priests wines were taken from them, but that for greater causes they ought to be restored into them againe; as Platina in the life of the said Pope sheweth.

Of the Difference of meates.

ARNOVL.

I thought not to haue proceeded any further, but that these 91. Sect. Ministers producing no place of Scripture for their Article, I determined to set downe a number of places whereof I bear booke are full, for a prooue of euery one of these points. But for that the places noted in the margin of this Article are distinctly set downe against abstinence from meates, I am content onely to produce this place, *Act. 15. 28.* For it seemed good vnto the Spirit and to vs, that you should abstaine from blood and from things strangled. Did this counsell proceed from Sathans forget? And may not the same Spirit by the Church prescribe fasting and abstinence from meates for some good end?

MOVLIN.

The holy Scripture commandeth fasting, and recommendeth it vnto the faithfull, but yet ordaineth no certaine dayes to fast, as Saint *Augustine* in his 86. Epistle saith.

non seiniare, & quibus oportet, precepto Domini aut Apostolorum non inuenio definitum.

1. Touching

1 Touching the distinction of meates, and the forbidding to use certaine kinds of meates, the Apostle Saint *Paul* expressly condemneth it, 1. Tim. 4. 1. where he calleth forbidding of meates a doctrine of diuels.

They thinke to auoide this, by saying that the Apostle speaketh not of those who abstaine from certaine meates with humilitie and to tame their flesh: but of those that esteemed meates to be polluted and abominable. That was long ago the pretence of those to whom the Apostle spake, and which in his time eered in that point, saying, *Eate not, touch not, taste not, as the Apostle, Coloss. 2. 20. saith, Why, as though ye liued in the world, are ye burthened with traditions? as, touch not, taste not, handle not, which all perish with the using, and are after the commandments and doctrines of men?* Then he addeth that which made the prohibition of meates (to those that forbade it) to seeme plausible, saying, *Which things haue indeed a shew of wisdom in voluntarie religion and humblenesse of minde, and in not sparring the body, not in any honour, so as the fastings of the flesh.* This is iustly the words and allegations of our Aduersaries, and the ends for which they ordaine and establish the distinction of meates, which neuertheless the Apostle reiecteth, calling them Commandements and Doctrines of men. It makes no difference whether he speaketh to the Jewes or to the Gentiles, seeing that generally he condemneth those that abstaine from meates with humilitie and by exercise.

a Aduersus
Psychicos.
b Reprobet
vian illos qui
iubeant ei-
bis abstinere,
sed de promi-
dentia Spiri-
tus sancti
gradum non
deu hereticos
perpetuam ab-
stinentia pro-
ceptores ad
deservenda &
despicienda co-
pula creatur.

Such also was the^a excuse of *Tertullian* a Montanist, in his booke *contra Psychicos*: for so he called true and faithfull Christians, because they fasted not enough, and as often as he would haue them, and abstained not from flesh and liquid things, and would haue fastings to be free at mens choice; and against him objected this place of the Apostle, which putteth the prohibition of meates among the doctrines of diuels. To whom this Montanist answereth thus, and saith in his 15. chapter, *The Apostle condemneth those which commanded to abstaine from meates.* ^b But it is because the holy Spirit, by his wisdom and foresight, condemned those hereticks

tickets before they came, that would command a perpetuall abstinence, to destroy and dissolve the works of the Creator. And againe: *We abstaine from meates which we reject not, but surceasse from the use of them for a time.* And a little after he saith, *The Apostle accused certaine correctors and forbidders of meates, which abstained from them with disdain, and not of duty.*

Such was the excuse of *Eustachius* Bishop of *Sebastia* in *Armenia*, as *Sozomenus* saith in the 13. chapter of his third booke, in the Preface of the Councell of *Gangres*, which is found in the Greeke Canons published by *Du Tillot*. In which Councell this *Eustachius* being reprov'd because he had introduced certaine distinctions of meates and apparrell, he excused himselfe, and said, *That he had not introduced those things upon a presumptuous opinion, but as an holy discipline, according to godlinesse.*

And if we would be over rigorous herein, we could not want proofes good store, to let you see how the Church of Rome hath travelled and laboured to make certaine meates abhominable among Christians. For Pope *Gregorie* the second, in an Epistle to *Boniface* Archbishop of *Mentz*, commandeth to suppress those, and to force them to do penance, which had eaten wilde or domesticall horses: For *that* (saith he) is *uncleane and execrable*. And *Zacharias* his successour writing to the same *Boniface*, forbiddeth Christians to eat layes, Crows, Storkes, Beavers, Hares, and wilde Horses. And I cannot imagine to what end that custome is vsed, to carry meate into the Church before Easter to coniuere it, if it be not thereby to take away the pollution, or to drive away the diuell from it.

The said Apostle in the same chapter, 16. verse, saith, *Let us man therefore condemne you in meate and drinke, or in respect of an holy day, or of the new Moone, or of the Sabbath dayes.* Then why doth the Church of Rome condemne vs for not observing their prohibitions of meates, and for not keeping those holy dayes which they ordaine?

The said Apostle in 1. Cor. 10. 29. saith, *Whatsoever is sold.*

Abstinemus ab eis quæ non rejicimus sed differimus. Ita ciebat quosdam castigatores et interdictores rectus incusare qui ex fastidio, non qui ex officio abstinentur.
in admodum brevis etiam tunc et dicit dominus etiam gloriosus mitem.

Agrostum Caballum aliquantos adinvenisti comedere, plerosque et domesticum. Hoc nequaquam fieri deinceps sanctissime frater sinas, sed quibus poteris modis per omnia comescere et dignam eis indicito perniciem, immundum enim est et execrabile.

sold in the fowles, eate ye, and aske no question for conscience sake; for the earth is the Lords; and all that therein is. If any of them which helome call you to a fast; and if you will go, what soeuer is set before you, eate, asking no question for conscience sake. What can be more expressly said? The Church of Rome esteemeth vs to be heretikes, and placeth vs among the ranke of infidels. Now if we should bid one of the Church of Rome to a dinner or supper, would he eate of all things that should be set before him vpon a fast or fasting day? would he with our scrupulositie eate of euery thing there?

4. But is it credible that Iesus Christ hath by the Gospell abolished the distinctions of meates in the Law of Moses to establish other distinctions, and to make prohibitions that are a thousand times more troublesome; and for one fasting day that was vnder the Law, to establish fiftie vnder the Gospell?

5. The Apostle Saint Paul in Cor. 8. 8. saith, *Admensura- hets vs, not acceptable to God, for neither if we eate nor if we be more, neither if we eate not, haue we the lesse.* And Rom. 14. 17. *The kingdome of God is not meate nor drinke, but righteousness, and peace, and ioy in the holy Ghost.*

And generally of all such obseruations, Saint Paul in 1. Tim. 4. 8. saith, *For bodily exercise profiteth little; but godlinesse is profitable vnto all things, which hath the promise of the life present, and of that that is to come.*

All this which is said before, is not spoken to condemne fasting; nor the obseruation of Ecclesiasticall fasts, ordinarie or extraordinarie; onely we seek to take away and abolish the opinion of merits and satisfactions thereby. And we make fasting to consist in abstinence and sobrietie, and not in distinction of meates, commanded by a man to whom God hath not given that power, and that vnder pretence of abstinence establisheth his Empire, and layeth a yoke vpon mens consciences contrary to the word of God. Likewise we condemne not him, who to qualifie the motions and prouocations of his desires or concupiscences, abstaineth from wine or from certaine meates; so that his fasting be voluntarie, and

and not scrupulous, nor with opinion of merit or satisfaction, nor by command vsurped ouer him by any man. Such was *Daniels* fast, abstaining from wine, flesh, and pleasant bread, *Daniel* 10. 3. for there was no law in *Israel* touching such abstinence.

Therefore it is in vaine here to make discourses in the praise of fasting and of sobrietie, which we know to be the nurses of vertues, guardians of chastitie, and prouocations to watchfulnesse. In the composing of mans bodie God placed the braines farre from the belly, to the end that the kitchen of the body should be far from the Study, and that the sauiour of meates should not interrupt meditation. For nothing more troubleth holy cogitations, then the tumult of drunkennesse or gluttonie. Nothing is harder to be brought to the feare of God, then a man who better relisbeth sweete sauces then wholsome instructions, and hath a better palate then a braine. Therefore the Scripture oftentimes ioyneth fasting with prayer, that prayer might sanctifie fasting, and that fasting might kindle prayer, So *Anna*, *Luke* 2. 37. and *Cornelius* *Acts* 10. 4. serued God in fastings and prayers. And *Iesus Christ* telleth vs of a certaine kinde of spirits, which are not driuen out but by fasting and prayer, *Matth* 17. 21.

The ancient Christians were much given to this exercise, abstaining from lawfull things, that they might the easiet auyde vnlawfull things. They sought to make diuerse necessarie things to become superfluous vnto them, whereas to those that are voluptuous superfluous things become necessarie.

But the Church of *Rome* hath changed this exercise into a scrupulositie, and this abstinence into a distinction of meates, which are more carefully obserued then the Law of God. For adulterie, fornication, murder, and periuie, ordinarie priests giue absolutions: but he that confesseth that he hath eaten flesh in an Ember weeke, is sent to a Penitentiarie, because the absolution of so great a sinne is not in the power of ordinarie priests.

abam

S

He

He that hath neuer so litle tasted of flesh in Lent, hath broken the fast, but not he that hath filled his gorge with fish and banquetting stuffe, &c. And the number of these obseruatione fasts are so great, that they almost take vp sixe moneths in the yeare. Fasting that should be an exercise of humilitie, is become an occasion of pride, and an opinion of merit, and of satisfaction, not onely for him that fasteth, but also for others. *Bellarmino* in his second booke of Good workes, chapter 14. goeth about to proue that fasting is satisfactorie for finnes; and meritorious for life eternall. And *Cardinall Tolet*, in his sixt booke of the Instruction of Priestes, saith, that fasting is *satisfactio pro peccatorum*, that is, a satisfaction for paines due for finnes: which satisfaction he saith to be *meritorious for grace, and an augmentation of glorie*. Fasting should serue for a confession of finnes; but at this day it serueth to establish mens selfe according to the example of the Pharisee, which boasted of his fasting before God; and therefore was reiected, *Luke 18. 12*. How pleasing a prayer do you thinke would it be vnto God, if a man should say, *Lord I haue deserved life eternall, for I haue not dined! Or why shouldst thou punish me for my finnes, seeing I haue satisfied for them by abstaining from eating of eggs and cheefe!* Yet this is but a small matter; for it is said that some fast oftener then they should do to satisfie for their finnes, and so there is a superabundance in their satisfaction. Then God owes them something which he is to retorne backe againe, that that surplussage might serue for others. And eating nothing but fish, a man may satisfie for others. Therefore *Tolet* saith, * *If I fast for foure persons, I satisfie as much for euery one of them, as if I fasted but for one.* See the Canon *Anima*, in the 13. Cause, second Question. And to fill vp the measure of this abuse, fastings are redeemed by money. As it is said in the Distinction 82. in the Canon *Presbyters*, and in the Glasse vpon the same Canon; *He may give a penny to redeeme or buy out the fast.* For certainly he must of force be light of beliefe, that beleeueth that God deliuereth a man out of Purgatorie because his neighbour did not dine. If the fastings of liuing men refresh the dead, then fasts made

* De instructione sacerdotum, lib. 2. cap. 8. Si quis pro quatuor, non minus prodest ad satisfactionem singulis quam unus prodest singulis ieiunantibus.

made by those that are alive must also burne the dead.

I confesse that God hath oftentimes granted deliuerances to those that fast. But it is a great abuse, to attribute that to the merit of fasting which is granted to faith and to prayer which sanctifieth the fast, without which fasting is either a diet for sicke persons, or a want to those that are hungry, or an hypocritical abstinence. Fasting serueth to obtain by suite, and not to satisfie.

To couer this abuse *M. Arnon* onely addeth a place out of the 15. of the Acts, where the Apostles assembled together in Councell in Ierusalem, commanded the Gentiles that were conuerted to the faith, to abstaine from bloud and from things that are strangled. But the Apostle *Saint Paul*, which was at that Councell, and knew the Apostles meaning, taketh away that prohibition, 1. Cor. 10. 27. where he saith, *If any of them which beleue not, call you to a feast, and if you will go, whatsoever is set before you, eat: asking no question for conscience sake.* Now it might be that in infidels houses they serued strangled fowles vpon the table, for something wherein there was bloud. Shewing thereby that such prohibitions were made, to the end that the Gentiles should not giue offence to the Iewes then newly conuerted to the profession of Christ, and by little and little to make them tractable, and to burie the legall ceremonies with honour. Now the Apostle hauing planted the Gospell in Corinth, Acts 18. and after going to Philippi, from thence wrote to the Corinthians; whereby it appeareth, that *Saint Paul* wrote that Epistle long time after that Councell was holden in Ierusalem, spoken of in Acts 15.

Diuerse ancient Churches, hauing not well considered that, haue most exactly obserued abstinence from bloud and things that were strangled, as *Tertullian* in the ninth Chapter of his Apologie witnesseth. The Councell of Gangres in the second Canon speaketh of bloud and things that are strangled, as of things esteemed to be vnlawfull. The same prohibition is found in the 67. Canon of the sixteenth Councell assembled in the pallace of Constantinople. The like also

* *Ne animalium quidem sanguinem in epulis esculis in habemus.*

* Elegisse
mihi videntur
Apostoli pro
tempore rem
facilem, in qua
cum Israelitis
genus aliquid
communiter
observarent.
Quia tam hoc
Christianus
observat ut
turdes vel mi-
nutores avi-
culas non at-
tingat, nisi
quarum san-
guis effusus
est. Et qui
forti pauci
illa tangere
formidant a
caeteris irri-
duntur.

is found in the Councils of Wormes and of Orleans. But Saint *Augustine*, better instructed in the holy Scriptures, explaineth this point in his 3^d. booke against *Faustus*, cap. 13. saying: The Apostles to accommodate themselves to the time, chose an easie thing, wherein the Gentiles should conveniently observe some-thing with the Israelites. And after addeth, What Christian is there, who at this time will observe the not touching of Thrushes, or other little birds, whose blood hath not bene shed? A few persons that make scruple of these things are mocked by others. The Church of Rome is of the same judgement, knowing well that the Apostles established those prohibitions for a time, and not for a perpetuall rule. But she is much to be condemned herein, for having in stead of those two prohibitions, established many other more grievous. Certainly, if the Christian Church had need of any observations touching the distinction of meates, it were much better to have revived the abstinences observed in the Apostles time, rather then to forge a multitude of others a thousand times more painfull, and contrarie to the practise of the Apostles and of Iesus Christ himselfe, who in the weeke before Easter usually did cate the Paschall Lambe.

THE XXV. ARTICLE.

Because we do not enjoy Iesus Christ but by the Gospell, we beleue that the order of the Church which hath bene established by his authority ought to be sacred and inviolable, and that therefore the Church cannot consist, vnlesse there be Pastors which haue the charge to teach, who ought to be honoured and reuerenced when they are duly called thereunto, and faithfully execute their offices. Not that God is tied to such inferiour aides or meanes, but because it pleaseth him to hold vs vnder such a charge and bridle.

die. Wherein we detest all fantastick persons, who as much as in them lyeth, would annihilate the Ministry, and the preaching of the word of God and Sacraments.

THE XXVI. ARTICLE.

We beleeue, that no man ought to withdraw himselfe from it, nor to content himselfe with himselfe, but that all men together ought to keepe & entertaine the vniity of the Church, submitting themselues to the common instruction, and to the yoke of Iesus Christ, and that wheresoeuer God shall haue established a true order of the Church, although Magistrates and their ordinances be contrarie thereunto, and that all those that ioyne not therewith, or separate themselues therefrom, do impugne the ordinance of God.

M. Arnaud finds nothing in these two Articles to carpe at.

THE XXVII. ARTICLE.

Of the Church.

Neuerthelesse we beleeue, that it is necessarie for vs carefully and with great prudence to discern which is the true Church, because the title thereof is by many falsly vsurped. We say therefore (according to the word of God,) that it is the assembly of the faithfull, which agree and consent to follow the same word, and the pure religion which dependeth thereon, and which

profit therein all the time of their liues, increasing and strengthening themselves in the feare of God, and proceeding forward in godlinesse; who though they strine neuer so much forward, yet they haue neede to pray for the remission of their sinnes. Howbeit we deny not but that among the faithfull there are hypocrites and reprobates, whose wickednesse cannot take away the name of the true Church.

ARNOX.

92. Self.

It is to put the Church cleane out of sight, when they give it those marks which are as much or more obscure, and lesse easie to be knowne then the Church is selfe: describing it by those signes which betwene vs and them are specially in controuersie: that is, to whom belongeth pure religion, and who is the Possessor of the word. Wherein they fall into the vice or fault of the circle so much blamed in Logicks, as if they should say, Which is the true Church? That which hath pure religion. Which is pure religion? That which is in the Church. By this I know no more then I did before. Which is Peter? It is Blistry. Which is Blistry? It is Peter. This is the circle wherein they covertly hold themselves, against those that with reason blame them for being gone out of the Church by the gate of apparences and shewes of the word of God.

Of the word Church, and the diuerse significations thereof.

MOVLIN.

Our aduersary fatts himselfe with the question of the visibility, and of the markes of the Church, with most pleasing eloquence, and such as serueth onely for quicke spirits. To looke better into this matter, it is necessarie for vs to vnfold the ambiguities of the word Church.

The word Church, is a Greeke word, which signifieth an assembly,

assembly, and which belongeth as well to the assemblies of infidels as of the faithfull. In the 26. Psalm, verse 5. according to the vulgar translation it is said, *I have hated the Church of euilldoers.* And Acts 19. 32. the assembly of the Pagans crying, *Great is Diana of the Ephesians,* is called the Church. We hath brought in a custome, that the assemblies of Christians are called Churches, and thereby were distinguished from the Synagogues of the Iewes, although these two words haue all one signification.

Odiui Ecclesiam malignantium.

Then to restraine our selues to the sence wherein this word Church is taken among Christians, I say, that this word Church in the Scripture is taken diuerse wayes. Sometimes the Church is taken for the whole bodie and assembly of the elect and those that are predestinated to saluation, whereof some are already triumphant in heauen, others militant here on earth, the rest not yet borne, but in the counsell of God are enrolled and registred to fight in Gods warre in future time, and ordained to obtaine the victorie. Saint Peter in his 1. Epistle 2. 9. calleth it *a chosen generation.* And because the Scripture saith, that the elect are written in the booke of life, and that their names are written in heauen, the Apostle, Hebr. 12. 32. calleth it, *The assemblie and congregation of the first borne, which are written in heauen.* This Church by the Apostle is often called the body of Christ, and by consequence, false, hypocritical, & prophane Christians are no part thereof: for the body of Iesus Christ hath no dead members, nor men cast off by God, as Saint Augustine in Chap. 21. of his second booke against Cresconius teacheth. And in his 5. booke, Chap. 27. of Baptisme, he saith, " That the same Church which is spoken of in the Canticles, the garden enclosed, that sister and spouse, &c. is the number of the righteous, which are called according to Gods decree, of whom it is said, *The Lord knoweth who are his.* For he that is a member of the body of Christ, cannot be a member of the diuell. This Church is the spouse of Iesus Christ, to the which he hath ioyned himselfe, that he might make it a glorious Church, without spot or wrinkle, to the end, that it should be holy and vnreprovable, Ephes.

Iam in corpore Christi nō sunt quideſt Eccleſia, quoniam non poteſt habere Chriſtum; membra damnata.

Numerus ergo ille iuſtorū, qui ſecundū propoſitum vocati ſunt de quibus diſtū eſt. Nouit Dominus qui ſui ſunt, iſſe eſt hortus concluſus, &c.

5. 27. Those that are of this Church, as long as they are here on earth, are visible as they are men, but not as they are elected, for election is not discerned by the eye, but is charitably presumed upon by the profession of faith, and by good works. Out of this Church there can be no saluation.

Sometimes by the word *Church* the Scripture understandeth all the assemblie of those that make profession to be Christians. That is the vniuersall visible Church, which is composed of diuers particular Churches; as in the Apostles time, the Churches of Corinth, Rome, Thessalonica, and the seven Churches spoken of in the 2. and 3. of the Apocalyps. Of these particular Churches some are purer then others, and some so impure that in them a man cannot be saved, specially when idolatrie is maintained, and the doctrine of the benefit of Christ wholly corrupted therein.

This vniuersall visible Church is that which the Apostle 1. Tim. 3. 14. calleth, *the pillar and ground of truth*, because the dutie thereof is, to yphold and maintaine the diuine truth against all those that seeke to corrupt and suppress the same. Which also is the duty of euery particular Church. And there is no particular Church which is found in faith, but it is a pillar and ground of the truth.

When we say, that out of this vniuersall visible Church there is no saluation, we vnderstand that no man can be saved which separateth himselfe from the communion of the vniuersall Church, and liueth apart, without ioyning himselfe to any flocke. Neuerthelesse, if any man should be excluded out of the communion of the Church by an vniust excommunication, or if any man seeking to become a Christian, and beleeuing in Iesus Christ, is preuented by death before he can be baptized, we do not beleeue that such a man is excluded from saluation. So that as well by our Confession, as also by that of our aduersaries, in this maxime (that out of the visible Church there is no saluation) there are some exceptions to be made.

Touching particular Churches, there is not one of them, whereof (to be saved) we must necessarily be a member. If
the

the Church of Rome were without error, yet a man might neuertheless be faued out of her. Those that shall liue in o-ther particular Churches where the Gospell is purely preached, shall not be without saluation, although they had neuer heard of the Romish Church, because it is but a particular Church.

Besides these three significations of the word *Church*, the Scripture sometimes vnderstandeth the people to be the Church, without comprehending the Pastors of the Church therein; as when Pastors are commanded to feed the Church, Acts 20. 28.

Sometimes also by the word *Church*, the Pastors onely are vnderstood, as in these words, *Tell the Church*, Matth. 18. 17. For Iesus Christ will haue the partie offended to go to the Pastors of the Church, to take vp the matter.

The conclusion of all this is, that the word *Church* in the Scripture is taken:

- 1 Sometime for all the assemblie of the elect.
- 2 Sometime for the vniuersall visible Church.
- 3 Sometime for a particular Church.
- 4 Sometime for the people onely.
- 5 Sometime for the Pastors onely.

These diuers significations of the word *Church*, are necessarie to be remembred, for that in the ambiguitie of the word the errour lieth hidden, and slippeth into it like a snake into brambles & briers. And our aduersaries expressly studying to confound this matter, take all those fiue significations for one. & as often as the Scripture speaketh of the Church, they will alwaies haue it to be vnderstood of the Church of Rome. Sometimes also by the Church they vnderstand the Pope onely, as Pope *Innocent* the third did, who attributed the contro-uerfie betweene *Philip Augustus* king of France, and *Iohn* king of England, to belong vnto himselfe, because in the Gospell it is said, *Dic Ecclesia*. In the chapter, *Nonis. Extra. de Indicijs*. And Cardinall *Bellarmino* in the second book of Councels, 19. chap. saith, *The Pope should tell it to the Church, that is, to himselfe*.

But specially in the question which *M. Arnonx* propoundeth

deeth touching the visibilitie of the Church, these distinctions are necessarie, to the end that when men speake of the visible Church, they should not produce those places of Scripture that speake of the Church of the elect, which is not discerned by the eye. To the end also that when we speake of the iudgements and decisions of the Church assembled together, we should not speake of the Church of the elect, which is neuer assembled to decide any causes. And to the end likewise that no particular Church should call it selfe vniuersall, as if all the rest were nothing, or were no Churches but by her permissiō.

So when men aske which are the marks of the true Church, our intent is not to speake of the Church of the elect, which hath no marks discernable by the eye. *God knoweth who are his*, 1. Tim. 2. 19. *He sealeth them by his Spirit vnto the day of redemption*, Ephel. 4. 30. and giueth them *the white stons* spoken of in Reuelation, 2. 17. which is the testimonie of the Spirit of adoption, which witnesseth with our spirits, that we are the children of God, Rom. 8. 16. But this witnesse is secret, and not exposed to the sight of man.

I say more, which is, that when we dispute of the marks of the true Church, we speake not of the vniuersall visible Church, the marks whereof are without question. For the marke which discerneth the vniuersall visible Church from the Iewes, Turkes, and Pagans, is the profession of Christianitie, and the sacrament of Baptisme. The disputation then is touching the particular Churches: for there being diuerse particular Churches disagreeing among themselves, we seeke those marks whereby the true Church, that is, the pure, and orthodoxall Church (wherein a man may be saved) is discerned from the impure, wherein there is no saluation. For by this word *true Church*, we must necessarily vnderstand the pure and the sound Church. For otherwise an hereticall Church may be called a true Church, euen as a man that hath a canker, or a plague sore, is yet a true man.

whether

Whether the Church be visible, and to whom it is visible.

Then to come to *M. Arnoux*, which accuseth vs that we put the Church out of sight, he saith it without prooffe, and our Confession saith nothing thereof. But on the contrarie we know that there hath alwayes bene, and shall be a Church visible in the world. But we must know how, and to whom it is visible. For it is one thing to see the Church as an assemblie of men calling themselves Christians, and another thing to see it to be a true and a pure Church, wherein a man may be saved. Those that are out of the Church, as Turkes and Iewes, see the Christian Church as we see a company of men, but see not whether it be good, and whether in it a man may be saved, which is the sight and the knowledge which we seeke for, that we may ioyne our selues thereunto. Infidels see the Church as the incredulous Iewes saw our Saviour, without knowing that he was the Saviour: and as a yong child sees a Mathematician, without knowing what a Mathematician is. As *Bellarmino* in his 25. Chapter of the third booke of the Church confesseth. Where neuerthelesse he slandereth vs, and imputeth to vs, that we do not acknowledge any visible Church.

Thereby it appeareth, that no man seeth or knoweth the true Church but those that are members thereof, or that after sufficient instructions haue determined to enter into the same. If the vniuersall Church were reduced but to twelue men onely, yet it should be visible to those twelue. On the contrarie, if the Christian Church should containe and possess the halfe of the world, the other halfe continuing in infidelitie, should not see that to be the true Church, and would not know it to be an assembly of the faithfull.

As touching this superficial sight whereby those that are out of the Church see it, and know not whether it be a true or a pure Church, if one should aske whether the Church ought in that sort to be visible to all men in the world, & at all times, the question is easie to be answered. For it is certaine, that

93. Sect.

*Videmus certū
hominum qui
est Ecclesiam
sed quid ille
certus sit ipsa
vera Christi
Ecclesia non
videmus.*



that the Christian Church began first in Iudæa, at which time it was not visible in France, nor in Denmarke. Before the Portugals and Spaniards sayled into the Indies, the Romane Church was not visible to the west Indians. And there are alwayes more Pagans then Christians in the world, and an infinite number of people that haue not once heard speaking of the Christian Church.

And to rise higher, was the Church visible then when *Abraham* was yet in *Chaldea*, liuing in his fathers house which was an idolater? as it is said in the 24. Chapter of *Iosua*. Was the Church visible vnto the Infidels when the Israelites were in *Egypt*, and there serued Idols? as it is said, *Ezech*. 20. 7. and 8. Was the Church visible to the Infidels in the time of king *Achas* and *Manasses*, when those kings made the Temple to be shut vp, and when no continuall sacrifice was made, and when Idols were in euery towne. when *Urias* the high Priest placed the Pagan altar in the temple? But where shall the Church be visible to those that are out of it, when all the earth shall follow the Beast? *Apocalyps* 13. 3. and when the time shall come whereof our Lord Iesus Christ speaketh, *Luk*. 18. 8. saying, *But when the Sonne of man commeth, shall he finde faith on the earth?* Shall the Church be visible to Infidels in the time wherein our aduersaries say that Antichrist shall abolish the continuall sacrifice, that is, the Masse, if you will beleue them?

To be short, it is an euident and visible thing, that the Church of God is not alwayes visible to all men: but alwayes visible to those that are members thereof.

Of the true Markes of the true Church.

94. Sect.

Touching the markes of the true Church, that is to say, touching the markes whereby we may discern a true, orthodox, all, & a pure Church, from an hereticall & an impure Church, our Confession in that Article putteth no other marke but the word of God purely preached; vnder which word we also compre-

comprehend the pure administration of the Sacraments: because the right and true vse of them is prescribed in the word of God. Wherein we speake according to Iesus Christ, who in the 8. 31. and 10. 27. of Saint *Iohn*, giueth no other marke to discern his sheepe and those that truly are his disciples, but onely to heare his voice, and to perseuer in his word; *If ye continue in my word, ye are verily my disciples*, Ioh. 8. 31. *The sheepe heare the voyce of the shepheard, and follow him; for they know his voyce, and will not follow a stranger.* And say that the word of God did not so expressely speake thereof, yet it is certaine, that we must be voyde of common sense, if we cannot conceiue, that to discern a pure Church from an impure, there is no other meanes then to see whether it agreeth with the rule of puritie, which is the word of God. As to know whether a Line be straight, we apply it to a straight Rule.

But that displeaseth *M. Arnone*, because (in his judgement) this marke is obscure, and as hard or hardlier to be knowne then the Church; and that it is the same whereof we dispute, that is, to whom belongeth pure Religion, and who possesseth the word. For he presupposeth, (and with reason) that the markes to know a thing by, ought to be plainer and easier to know, then the thing which we know by those markes.

Then the question is, which of these two things is easiest to be knowne, either true faith and Religion, or the true Church.

Besides the places of Scripture before alledged, which will haue vs to know the true sheepe and disciples of Iesus Christ, that is, if they hearken to his voyce and keepe his word, reason giueth vs a demonstratiue prooffe, grounded vpon this maxime, that definitions and expositions of things ought to be clearer and better knowne then those things which are expounded or defined. Now the definition of the true Church is, that it is the assembly of true beleeuers. Then before we can know which is the true Church, we must know who are true beleeuers, and by consequence, which is true faith:

faith. Now if we will define the Church as *Bellarmine* doth, which is, that the Church is the assembly of those which are ioyned together by confession of the Christian faith; we must necessarily know what is true Christian faith, before we know the true Church, seeing that true faith is a chiefe point whereby to define the Church. From thence also it followeth that we must know Iesus Christ; that is, his nature and office, before we can know the true Church; for that faith in Iesus Christ is of the very definition of the Church. But see here a Jesuiticall Doctor, that will haue vs to know the true Church before we know the true doctrine; and by consequence before we know Iesus Christ. Which is a strange conceit, to imagine that a man may know which is the true Church without knowing Iesus Christ, and who are true beleeuers without knowing true faith.

Add hereunto, that it is necessarie to know and to be instructed in the word of God, before we can discern the true Church; seeing that we know not that there must be a Church in the world but only by the word of God. By the which God who declareth vnto vs, that his will is that there should be a Church, declareth also what manner of Church he would haue it to be; and giueth vs markes to know it by.

Our Aduersaries themselves unwittingly say the same as often as they alledge the Scripture for themselves, & ground the authoritie of their Church vpon the testimonies of the word of God. For thereby they presuppose that the knowledge of the contents of the Scripture is necessarie, before they can know whether they haue the true Church; seeing they ground their Church vpon the Scripture.

Add hereunto, that there being diuerse contrarie Churches; and but one word of God, contained in the Scriptures; and acknowledged by all the Churches in the world; an infidell that would become a Christian, but is in doubt to which Church he should yeeld himselfe, cannot determine thereupon but by beginning with the knowledge of that which all Christians receiue and embrace, which is the holy Scripture.

And

And I cannot conceive how in this doubt which Church is the purest of all, it is possible to take any other marke, or any other direction then the rule of puritie, which is the word of God. Now if there were any one, who before he had any knowledge of true religion, had met with the true Church, and ioyned himselfe with the good flocke, I say that such a man, as long as he is so, is not a true Christian. He is like a blinde man that layeth hold on the first man that reacheth his hand vnto him. Such a man hath no heresies, because he hath no knowledge, and by consequence no faith nor pietie. He deriueeth his Religion from his birth, or from custome, or from the concourse of ciuill affaires. If he were borne in an other countrey, or if the State should alter and be changed, he would haue another religion: he followeth the true Church without knowing whether it be the true Church, and is a Christian, and knowes not Christ.

Reade all the historie of the New Testament, and you shall neuer finde, that any man did acknowledge the true Church, before he was instructed in the doctrine of the Gospell. But on the contrarie, we see that the Apostles preached Iesus Christ and the doctrine of Salvation, and that the people by beliefe in that doctrine ioyned themselves to the Church, without making any other enquire touching the markes of the Church.

If men haue maliciously made difficulties touching the knowledge of the true doctrine, that ought not to be imputed to the obscuritie or incertainty of this Marke, but to the malice of men. For all difficulties laid aside, that which resteth cleare and manifest in the holy Scripture, hauing no need of interpretation, is sufficient to saluation. And besides that, they are difficulties which men may auoyde, and whereupon we must craue the aide and assistance of God, which he hath promised. But to know the true Church before we know the true doctrine, it is not onely difficult, but also impossible. For, how shall I know whether this Church is a true Church and pure in faith, if I know not what the puritie of true faith is, nor what true doctrine is?

This

This appeareth by the impossibilitie and absurditie of the markes which our Adversaries propound, whereby to know the true Church.

*Of false Markes to know the Church: and first of
the title of Catholike.*

95. Sect.

The first marke of the Church, they say is, that she is Catholike. If by Catholike they vnderstand a sound opinion, right faith, and true belife, as the ancient Fathers often take that word, who for that cause spake of Catholike Churches in the plurall number, we willingly allow and receiue that for a marke: for it is the same that we say, that the puritie of doctrine is the onely marke of the true Church.

But if by Catholike they vnderstand Vniuersall, then that marke is false, and contrarie to common sense. For seeing that the quarrell is betweene particular Churches, is it not a contradiction against themselves, to seeke among particular Churches to haue that to be the best which is not particular, but vniuersall? So in the disputation betweene the Greeke and the Romane Churches, how should I know that the Church of Rome is vniuersall, seeing that there being a Greeke Church, it is a prooofe that the Church of Rome is not vniuersall? And the Greeke Church also calleth it selfe Catholike, and the Patriarch thereof for aboute 900. yeares together was called Vniuersall. This disputation betweene particular Churches, to know to which of them the title of the Vniuersall Church belongeth, hath no better grace, then if Asia, Affrica, and Europe, which are parts of the vniuersall world, should dispute among themselves to know to which of them the title of Vniuersalitie belongeth. Time was, that the Churches of Syria and Egypt, &c. agreed with the Church of Rome: then all those Churches were called Catholikes, that is, Orthodoxall, and following the faith which ought to be vniuersall. But neither the Syrian, nor the Egyp-

Egyptian Churches called themselves Romane: but all of them together called themselves, The Vniuersall Church.

Of Antiquitie.

They also produce Antiquitie for a marke of the true Church. If they vnderstand that that Church is the true Church whose doctrine is most ancient of all, and that doctrine which is conformable to the Apostles times, we allow of that marke; and by it the Church of Rome will lose her suite, which hath made a thousand new additions, and every age increaseth them, all tending to the aduancement of the Papall Empire. For it was requisite to haue great alteration in religion, to bring to passe that the Bishop of one Towne should become the earthly Monarch of all Christendome, and to surpasse the greatest Kings of the world in riches: Is it to be found (I speake not of the vniuersall Church) that any particular Church in the first ages of the Church did exclude the people from the participation of the chalice? or that read the Scripture to the people in a language which they vnderstood not? or that hath forbidden Christians to reade the holy Scriptures without speciall licence? or that made pictures and representations of the Trinitie? or that worshipped Images? or that called the virgin *Mary* Queene of heauen, and Lady of the world? or that beleued that the Pope can depose Emperours and Kings? or that the Pope hath the superabundant satisfactions of Saints in the Treasury of the Church; and that he can draw soules out of Purgatorie? or hath adored the host with the diuine worship called Latria? Where is the least mention made in all Antiquitie of the Romish Indulgences, of Pardons of 800000. yeares, of holy graines, and of Rosaries? of the least mention of the Court of Rome, of Cardinals, of the order of begging Friers? of praying to God without vnderstanding what a man saith? and that Bishops ought to take oathes of allegiance to the Pope

96. *Sell.*

upon their admissions? Herein our aduersaries hold their tongues and say nothing; and by their silence accuse Antiquitie to haue bene ignorant in religion.

Furthermore, a doctrine cannot be called ancient, which hath not bene from the beginning. As copper by age will neuer become gold, so a lie will still be a lie notwithstanding Antiquitie: there is no prescription against God and his word. And as shamellesse women, the older they grow the impudenter they are, so vntruth is more dangerous by processe of time, because it still taketh more roote. We dispute not by yeares, but by reasons; and that which at this day is called ancient was once new. Let them tell me how many yeares are required to authorise a doctrine.

I say more, that the oldnesse of a chaire, is a presumption that there is something to be mended, seeing that from the time of the Apostles, corruption then began to creepe into the Church, and that Saint Paul saith, that in his time the mysterie of iniquitie began to be hatched, 2. Thel. 2.

Of Succession. The third Marke.

97. Sol.

Above and before all others, they make account of a lineall Succession, continued from the Apostles times. This marke might haue serued once in the ages next ensuing after the Apostles, when all the chaires erected and set vp by the Apostles agreed together, and when the Succession was short, and the memory of the beleefe (holden by the Bishops after the Apostles times) fresh. But now this marke is vnprofitable; because of the length of so many ages, and the intricacie and contradiction of Histories; but specially because the chaires which draw their succession from the Apostles are now in discord and separated from communion. Among the which that of Rome which seeketh to draw her succession from Saint Peter, is condemned by the rest of the chaires, which also draw their Succession from Saint Peter, that is, by the Church of Antiochia, and of Alexandria; among which the

the Church of Rome is the newest and the most corrupt, and condemned by all the rest. So that if we should stand vpon the succession of chaires, it will be hard to range it to the Church of Rome.

If the succession of chaires since the Apostles times be a marke whereby ignorant people should know the true Church, how is it possible that plaine countrie people, artificers and women should know this succession, which is learned onely by reading of the Greeke and Latine Fathers, the length and obscurity whereof wearie the wisest men, and which oftentimes contradict themselves?

Adde hereunto that the pretended succession of the Pope, is partly broken off by heresies which haue defiled that chaire, and by schismes which haue oftentimes cut off the line of that pretended succession, and neuer was knit againe, as we haue proued in the booke of the Vocation of Pastors.

Adde hereunto, that the doctrine of the Church of Rome, is contrary to Saint Peters doctrine. The succession of the chaire without succession of doctrine, is rather a subversion of the chaire then a succession. We shall not be iudged by chaires at the latter day, but by the rules of the word of God. Chaires speake not, but men speake, who not onely speake lies in chaires, but also make vse of chaires to tell lies, and seeke to authorise lying by the dignity of chaires and by succession. They make a chaine of sand which cannot bind mens consciences. They shew a list of Popes in print, without shewing whether the last of them are of the same religion that the first were. It is a succession in persons, and a contrariety in faith. *Those haue not the succession of Saint Peter, which haue not Saint Peters Faith.* So saith Saint Ambrose in his first booke and sixth Chapter of Penitence.

*Non habent
hereditatem
Petri, qui fi-
dem Petri non
habent.*

*Of perpetuall Continuance. The fourth pretended
Marke.*

They also bring perpetuall continuance for a marke. If this

make her good, diuerse Churches planted by the Apostles were false Churches, seeing they haue ceased to be Churches. And there are diuerse Churches which the Church of Rome calleth heretickes and schismatickes, which haue continued euer since the Apostles time, and yet to this day continue. But for that the small continuance of a Church cannot be scene but at the end of the world, I would aduise that the determination of this question should be put off vntill the end of the world. For some Church may flourish now, which within short time may haue an end.

Of Multitude and Greatnesse. The fifth Marke.

99. Sect.

Our aduersaries place Multitude and greatnesse of number among the markes to discern the true Church. This marke makes vs euidently see and perceiue, that our aduersaries seeke the markes of a particular Church: for as touching the vniuersall Church, they confesse that it is but small in number in respect of the Pagans and infidels. But there being many particular Churches which contend together, they will haue the greatest to be the best. Now there is no colour to make that a marke of the true Church, wherein the true Church is surmounted by Mahumetans and Pagans: and much lesse apparence that to know the true Church we must haue a rope to measure the length and breadth of it, or to number the persons in stead of propounding the rules thereof. By this reason, of two small heretical Churches, the lesse shall alwayes be the worst. And when the ten tribes which made three quarters of the land of Israel, reuolted in *Roboams* time and became idolaters, they were to be followed. By this account Iesus Christ misreckoned himself when he called his Church a little flock, Luk. 12. 32. and when he will haue vs to go in at the narrow gate and straight way, wherein but few do enter, because the wide gate and broad way whereat many go in leadeth to perdition, Math. 7. 13. And when the high Priests and the Do-

ctors,

And, and the greatest part of the people held with the Pharisees, the Jewes should rather haue followed the Pharisees, then Iesus Christ. There was a time when the Greeke Church was at discord with the Romane Church, at which time it was greater then the Romane, and had the power of the Empire to vphold it. And the holy Ghost foresheweth, that a time shall come whe all the earth shall follow the beast, Reuel. 13. To be short, these people for a marke of the true Church, take the multitude which the Scripture placeth on the false Churches side, as if one should set painting and powders for markes of chastitie, and to be without bookes, for a marke of knowledge.

In the second booke of Theodorets Historie, Liberius Bishop of Rome, speaking to the Emperour Constantine, that vpbraid vnto him that he was alone, said, *Although I am alone, the cause of faith is not the weaker.* And Gregorie Nazianzen in his Oration against the Arrians saith, *What are they that vpbraid vs with our povertie? which define the Church by multitude, and despise the little flocks? As they haue the people, so we haue the faith; they haue gold and silver, we haue faith, and doctrine.* This is our condition.

Of Miracles. The sixth pretended Marke.

Of the same nature are Miracles, which they also make to be a marke of the true Church, which Iesus Christ in the latter times makes to be markes of the false Church, saying, that *There shall arise false Christs, and false Prophets, and shall shew great signes and wonders, to seduce (if it were possible) the very elect.* Math. 24. 23. And Saint Paul saith, *That the sonne of perdition shall come with all power and effectfull working of Satan, and signes and lying wonders.* 2. Thess. 2. 9. Many shall say vnto Iesus Christ at the latter day, *Haue we not by thy name prophesied? and by thy name cast out diuels? and by thy name done many great workes?* And then Christ shall say vnto them, *I neuer knew you, depart from me ye workers of iniquitie.* Math. 7. 22. 23. So in

Lib. de Pra-
scrip. cap. 44.

Tertullian the hevetickes boasted and bragged that they wrought most miracles. As the miracles done at the publication of the Law did still serue to authorise the Law after miracles ceased in Israel; so miracles done in the publication of the Gospell by Iesus Christ and by the Apostles, do yet serue to authorise the Gospell; although miracles haue ceased. When king *Iosias* openly shewed the booke of the Law which had bene suppressed, 2. Chron. 34. he had no need to do any miracle, because he shewed no new thing. *An euill and an aduerous generation seeketh a signe*, Matth. 12. 39. It belongeth to the Church of Rome to do miracles, because she propoundeth new doctrine. But what miracles doth she; and when? They are miracles oftentimes condemned of falsehood, and punished by iustice. Miracles onely wrought to driue out diuels, wherein the fiction is very easie, and wherein Sathan taketh pleasure, coming forth of set purpose to authorise a lie. And yet that is neuer done before vs, for in the presence of a man which feareth God, and beleueth in Iesus Christ, Sathan loseth his credit.

Of Vnitie. The seventh pretended Marke.

101. Self.

They also giue for a marke of the Church, that it is *One*. Which is a pleasant and most certaine marke. For there is nothing in the world which is not *one*; euery horse is *One*, and euery tree is *one*, and the Sunne is *one*. By this meanes they giue vs a thing to be a marke of the Church which agees also to an egge or to a lettuce. If by this word *One*, they vnderstand *vnited* and living in concord with all the Churches in the world; the Church of Rome shall not be the true Church, for she is at controuersie with her neighbours. And there would be no true Church in the world, because it is impossible to agree with all Churches: and Christian religion should be false, because it is diuided into sects and heresies. Or if by this word *One* they vnderstand *vnited* in it selfe, and hauing no discord within it, this vnion belongeth not to the Church of Rome, wherein.

wherein there is a great debate touching the principall point of religion, that is, which is the head and soueraigne of the Church, the Pope or Councils. For there can be no greater nor more important a quarrell in any State, then to dispute and make question to whom the soueraignie belongeth. Also vpon the question whether the Pope may depose kings and cause them to be slaine, whereof there are infinite bookes on both sides written. And to speake of particular men, you shall hardly find two men which in all things agree together, one is content to pray vnto God without calling vpon Saints, another beleeueth not Purgatorie, another mocks at pardons, another imagineth a manner to participate in the body of Christ otherwise then his Church beleueeth. But if a man will go to Masse, and allow of the Popes authoritie, all this is tollerated. In the meane time the Council of Trent excommunicateth all those which disallow of any of the points of the Romish Churches doctrine. In such manner, that there are not many persons found in the Church of Rome which are not excommunicated by the generall iudgement of their Church. He that would take the paines to reade the bull *De Cena Domini*, which the Pope publickly pronounceth and thundreth out euery yeare on Thursday before Easter, shall find, that the French kings and their Courts of Parliament, and the most part of French men, are therein excommunicated and made as blacke as a soale, by the strongest and most solmne excommunication which is pronounced in the Church of Rome. And if it were not for the great profits and riches which knit the parts of the body together, as twins with different heads but ryed together by the bellies, we should soone see the great body of the Church of Rome scattered and disperfed.

On the contrary, there are many hereticall Churches, whose bodies are ouer strongly vnited, and whereof the members liue peaceably together. As the Turkes, enemies to Christians, who haue a very great Empire, neuer disputing amons themselves of any points of their religion.

It is nothing to the purpose to tell vs, that we are at vari-

ance with the Lutherans and the Anabaptists, for the Church of Rome also is at variance with them: Nor to serue their turnes against vs with those arguments which the Turkes and Jewes vie against the Church of Rome with the like reason, which obiekt against her, that she agreeth not with so many Christiā Churches. Discord with other Churches is no prooffe of error, but contrariety to the word of God. But where truth is, Sathan seeketh to raise trouble. Adde hencunto that there are many Churches which men thinke to be at discord with vs, which neuertheless agree with vs touching the grounds and the essentiall parts of pietie, and the meanes to attaine to saluation.

Of Holinesse. The eighth pretended Marke.

102. Self.

Lastly, they put Holinesse for a marke of the true Church. If they vnderstand holinesse of manners, the Church of Rome doth not attribute this praise and commendation vnto her selfe, but willingly confesseth the enormitie of her vices. If they vnderstand her holinesse to be in doctrine, we willingly allow of this marke. For that holinesse is no other thing but puritie in doctrine.

Which also ought to be said touching the title of Apostolicall, for that is the Apostolicall Church, which followeth the doctrine of the Apostles. Many Churches founded by the Apostles, striving to hold the chaire, haue lost the doctrine.

Of the Circle in disputation.

ARNOVE.

103. Self.

Whereby they fall into the faults of the Circle blamed in Logicks. Which is the true Church? That which hath pure religion. Which is pure religion? That which is in the Church. I know as much.

now as I did before. Which is Peter? It is Blitry. Which is Blitry? It is Peter. Behold the Circle wherein they covertly keepe themselves, against those which with reason blame them to have gone out of the Church by the gate of apparences of the pure word of God.

MOVLIN.

Aristotle in the second booke *Priorum Analyticorum*, chapter 5. speaketh of a circular syllogisme, which is made when after a man hath made one syllogisme he makes another, wherein the conclusion of the first syllogisme becomes one of the propositions, which ioyned with the other proposition conuerted, the conclusion which followeth is no other thing but the proposition of the first syllogisme, in place whereof the conclusion was set. Whereby it appeareth that *M. Arnonx* understands not what a circle in Logicke is: for every circle is composed of syllogismes, but this circle which *M. Arnonx* giueth vs, is not a syllogisme. Who is *Peter*? It is *Blitry*. Who is *Blitry*? It is *Peter*. Which are words of some shew, and a conception fit for the Court, where mens spirits are polished. This Doctor discerneth not what difference there is betweene a circular syllogisme and a conuertible proposition: and yet in giuing vs a conuertible proposition, he conuerteth it very unjustly. The conuertible proposition which he propoundeth, is, *The true Church is that which hath true religion*. Let vs see how he conuerteth it: which is thus: *Pure religion is that which is in the Church*. This is not to conuert but to peruert. To conuert it truly, he should say, *Pure religion is that which hath the true Church*, which should be an absurd proposition: whereby it appeareth, that fallisly for a conuertible proposition, he putteth one which cannot be conuerted without spoiling. Therefore he hath in such sort wrapt and intangled himselfe in this circle, that he himselfe is taken therein, as one that hath failed in his coniuration. And his conception of *Peter Blitry*, and of *Blitry Peter*, hath no more conceit then his imaginary circle. Also let him know that the sensible properties of a subject, and conuertible with

with this subject, do not consist to be marks whereby to know the subject. As in these propositions, Every horse neigheth, every fire burneth, every Adamant stone draweth iron to it. Then let him not thinke it strange, if the pure preaching of the word be a marke of the true Church, and yet conuerteth with the Church. Of two conuertible termes the one is ordinarily more knowne then the other, and a man may make use of the one to make the other knowne.

Of the Church, and of the Markes thereof.

ARNOVI.

104. Self.

Places of Scripture noted in the margin of the Confession, Ephes. 2. 20. Being built upon the foundation of the Apostles and prophets, Iesus Christ himselfe being the chiefe corner stone. And 4. 11. 12. He therefore gave some to be Apostles, and some Preachers, and some Evangelists, and some Pastors and Teachers, for the repairing of the Saints, for the worke of the Ministry, and for the edification of the body of Christ; and 2. Timothy 3. 15. That thou hast knowne the holie Scriptures of a child, which are able to make thee wise to salvation, through the faith which is in Christ Iesus.

By all these places we see that the Apostle goeth on distinguishing all the bodies, and the buildings of the Church in her members and officers, the better to instruct us touching the diversities of graces, the ordaining of charges, and the intent which God had in the establishing of so faire a Monarchie. But he saith nothing of giving us her puritie of the word, or puritie of religion for markes of the Church, for that such things ought rather to be knowne by the Church, which makes us know them.

MOWLING.

Of these three places, the first is very fit to prove that which

which our Confession saith; which is, that the true Church is that which conformeth her selfe to the word of God. For whosoever groundeth himselfe vpon the Prophets and the Apostles, of necessitie will conforme himselfe to their words, and will follow their instructions. And note, that there Saint Paul speakes of the body of the Church, which he liketh to a building, saying, *In whom all the building coupled together groweth vnto an holy temple of the Lord.* Then if the Church be grounded vpon the doctrine of the Apostles, the doctrine of the Apostles must go first; and that as the true Church is grounded vpon the doctrine of the Apostles, so the knowledge of the true Church should be grounded vpon the knowledge of the Apostles doctrine.

The second place also is very fit for the same purpose: for God hath not ordained Prophets, Apostles, and Euangelists, to any other end, but that we should follow their words; and this subiection of the faithfull consenting to obey their word, is that which maketh the assembly of the Saints, and the building of the body of Christ, which is the Church.

The third place is very pertinent and effectually to proue that the knowledge of the Scriptures makes the faithfull, and by consequence the true Church wise to saluation. Now the Church cannot be made wise to saluation by the word of God contained in the holy Scriptures, without following that word, and conforming it selfe thereunto.

And whereas *M. Arminius*, in stead of acknowledging the pure word of God to be a marke which maketh the Church knowne, will haue that the Church maketh knowne vnto vs which is the pure doctrine; he sheweth thereby, that he conceiueth not what the state of the question is, nor the point of our difference. For the difficultie is, how among diuers Churches contrary in beleefe, a man may know the best, and that which propoundeth true doctrine. Therein, none of those Churches ought to be iudges, because they are parties; and therefore it is requisite and necessarie, that among those parties contending together, there should be a common rule, which serueth to discern the pure Church from the impure.

Now

Now there is nothing but the word of God which is the rule of puritie. I grant that the true and orthodoxall Church teacheth pure doctrine, but we are at variance which is the true orthodoxall Church, whereof we will haue God by his word to be Iudge. But the Church of Rome will be Iudge in this cause, and will be both Iudge and party: and to the end that she may not be contradicted by the word of God, hideth this word from the people, and forbiddeth them to reade the holy Scripture: and also saith, that she is the infallible Iudge of the Scripture, and of the sence and the authoritie of the Scripture. It is true that the orthodoxall Church teacheth the word of God, not as a Iudge, but as a witnesse and a guardian of the truth. But the word of God maketh the true Church to be knowne with infallible authoritie of a Iudge, and ordaineth what the true Church ought to be.

Which is so certaine and true, that we should not know that God will haue a Church to be in the world, if the holy Scripture taught it not. The which declaring that there must be a Church, declareth also by what markes it shall be knowne, which is, if she hearkeneth to the voyce of the good Pastor, and followeth not a stranger: John 10. 4. 5. and if she perseuereth in the word of God, John 8. 31.

Seeing there is but one holy Scripture, it will easily make vs know the pure Church: But there being many contrarie Churches, vnto which of them must we referre our selues touching pure doctrine? And how will she perswade a man that her doctrine is conformable to the word of God, which to obey the Church of Rome dares not looke into the holy Scripture?

If the true Church doth beare witnesse that this is the holie Scripture, she doth it because she is bound to say so: but God is not bound to speake to vs in his holy word, which the Church must obey. Now how can I know whether she obeyeth this word, if before I beleue the Church I do not know what the word is, nor what it commandeth to be done?

He

He that hath no other prooffe to know the word of God, but onely because the Church telleth him so, hath but a very slight and an easie impression thereof, and a coniecture without knowledge, vntill such time as he himselfe hath tasted and comprehended the doctrine of saluation, and that God thereby hath imprinted faith and repentance in his heart.

But now let vs see by what markes *M. Arnoux* will haue the vniuersall Church to be knowne.

Markes whereby M. Arnoux will haue the true Church to be knowne.

ARNOUX.

Contrary places of the Scripture. They must yeeld themselves to the Creed or Simboles by them receined in their Confession of the faith, in the fifth Article, wherein are shewed the markes of the Church, as vnitie, holinesse, vniuersalitie, and succession from the Apostles, &c. All drawne and taken out of the holy Scripture. One Ephes. 4. 5. Holy, 1. Cor. 6. 11. Catholicke, Marke 16. 15. Apostolicke, Plal. 10. 18. Spouse of Iesus Christ, Osee 2. 19. The house of God. Mathew 16. 18. Visible, Psal. 18. 6. Pillar and ground of truth, 1. Tim 3. 15. All these together, Cant. 4. 6. 8. 9. He is blind and very blind which seeth not this.

105. Sect.

MOVLIN.

It is a great error to thinke that all that which the Scripture or Symboles say of the Church, should be a marke whereby to know the visible Church. Saint Paul, Ephes. 5. 25. saith, *That Christ loued the Church.* And in the Canticles it is often called the welbeloued. And Heb. 12. 22. the Church is called *The assembly and congregation of the first borne, which are written in heauen.* Would *M. Arnoux* haue the loue which Iesus Christ beareth to his Church, or to be written in heauen, to be markes whereby to discern the visible Church? It is very true, that there is but one vniuersall Church; but doth it there-

therefore follow that this word *One* is a proper marke to know the true Church from the false: seeing also that euery false Church is *one*. Adde hereunto, that *M. Arnoux* searcheth for the markes of the vniuersall visible Church, but this vniuersall Church likewise containeth the false. We haue also shewed that *vnitie*, *vniversalitye*, *holinesse*, and the succession of the Apostles, agree not with the Church of Rome. The Greeke and Syrian Churches boast that they haue these markes, in such manner that the discord still continueth vntill we come to the word of God, which endeth the contention, and makes the truth knowne. And this is the reason why the Church of Rome hindreth the reading of it, and diminisheth the authority thereof.

One.

M. Arnoux
falsehood.
Holy.
Falsehood.

Let vs see what places *M. Arnoux* setteth downe vnto vs. He saith, that the Church is called *one*, in Ephes. 4.5. This is the verse, *There is one Lord, one faith, one baptism.* Of the Church here is nothing spoken. Thus you see already one falsehood.

He saith that the Church is called *holy*. 1. Cor. 6. 11. That also is falsly alledged. The place is thus, *And such were some of you, but ye are washed, but ye are sanctified, but ye are iustified, in the name of the Lord Iesus, and by the Spirit of our God.* Wherein there is nothing spoken of the vniuersall Church. For in the vniuersall visible Church all are not sanctified, ordinarily there are more wicked then good in it. This is a second falsehood.

Catholicke.
Falsehood

He saith that the Church is called *Catholicke*, Marke 16. 15. This also is falsly alledged. The place is thus: *And he said vnto them, Go ye into all the world and preach the Gospel to euery creature.* Of the Church nor of vniuersality there is nothing spoken. It may be that he thought these words *all the world and all creatures*, signified the Catholicke Church. That is false, for by these words Pagans and Infidels are also vnderstood, to whom the Apostles preached, and whereof the greatest part beleueed nor their preaching. This is the third falsehood.

Apostolicall.
Falsehood.

He addeth, that the Church is called *Apostolicall*, Psal. 10. 18. That likewise is false, the place is thus, *To iudge the fatherlesse and the oppressed, that the man of the earth may no more oppresse*

oppress. The lanterne of *Iudas* which is kept in *S. Denis* Church might with as good reason haue bene alledged to this purpose. And it is not to be imagined that there is any fault in the cypher, for in all the *Psalmes* there is nothing spoken of the *Apostolicall Church*. Then this is the fourth falshood.

He saith, that the Church is called the *Sponse of Iesus Christ*, *Sponse of Iesus Chr. 3.* *Ofce 2. 19.* To what purpose serues that, when here we speake of the markes of the visible Church? Is the coniunction and nearenesse of the Church with Iesus Christ a marke of the visible Church? Is that a marke which is discerned by the eye? Adde hereunto that this honourable title belongeth principally to the Church of the elect, to the which Iesus Christ hath ioyned himselfe to make it a glorious Church without spot or wrinkle, *Ephes. 5. 27.*

He adderh further, that in *Math. 16. 18.* the Church is called the *House of God*: Although no mention of the house of God is found in that place, yet let vs put the case that it were truly alledged. For to be the house of God, is that a marke of the visible Church? Do those that are out of the Church see God dwelling therein? Adde hereunto, that there is no false Church which pretendeth not to be the house of God.

He goeth on and saith, that the Church is called *visible*, *In the Hebrew it is the 19. Psalm 8 & 4. verse.* *Psal. 18. 5.* This is most false. The true place according to the Hebrew is thus, *Their line is gone out through all the earth, and their words to the end of the world: in them hath he set a tabernacle for the Sunne.* Of the which Sunne he after describeth the beauty, swiftnesse, and heate, but speaketh not of the visible Church. The vulgar translation saith, *In Sole posuit tabernaculum suum, He hath set his tabernacle in the Sunne.* Which corruption being receiued, yet therein nothing is spoken of the visible Church. *Sanctes Pagninus*, a *Lucquois* & a *Iacobin Frier*, translateth this place as we do, & *Arias Montanus* a *Spanish Doctor* doth the like. But *Sixtus Senensis* keeper of the Popes library reiecteth that exposition, and saith that the true and proper sense of those words is, that God hath set a tabernacle for the Sunne in heauen. So here you haue a fift falshood, and that ioyned with a sopperie.

For

For what appareance is there to place visiblenesse among those markes which discern the true Church from the false, seeing that the false Church also is seene, and that to be visible is also proper to a tree, or to an horse? The markes whereby men discern one thing from another, ought to be proper vnto them. And what makes that against vs, which seknowledge the Church to be visible?

He also saith, that the Church is called the *ground and pillar of truth*, 1. Tim. 3. 15. which is true, for it belongeth to the Church to defend and support the truth against errors. But what is that to the purpose, when we speake of the markes of the visible Church? is the duty of the Church a marke of the Church? How absurdly should I speake, if I should say, that one of the markes to know a vertuous man from a vicious man, is, that the vertuous man ought to be wise?

Lastly, he saith that in the fourth Chapter of the Canticles verse 6. 7. 8. 9. all these markes are found together. Let the Reader peruse the places, and he shall not there find one trace or footstep of any of these markes. Then this is the fixt falsehood. Where is conscience? Is not this an abusing of the people? Doth the Doctor in this manner contend against the places noted in the margent of our Confession, by heaping vp so many falsehoods in so few lines? But it is true, that lying cannot be defended but by lyes, and by corrupting of the holy Scripture.

Falshoods
heapt one
vpon ano-
ther.

THE XXVIII. ARTICLE.

Of the Confession of faith.

*Whereupon M. Arnoux disputeth againe of the perpetuities of the Church, and of her markes, and
Of Saint Peters Supremacie.*

Vnder this beleefe we affirme, that there where the
word

word of God is not receiued where they make no profession to subiect themselves thereunto; and where there is no vse of the Sacraments, to speake properly, we cannot affirme that there is any Church. Therefore we condemne the assemblies of the Papists, because the pure truth of God is banished from thence, wherein the Sacraments are corrupted, adulterated, falsified, or wholly annihilated: and wherein all superstitions and idolatries haue their full swinge. We hold therefore that all those which deale in such actions & communicate therein, separate and cut themselves off from the bodie of Iesus Christ. Neuerthelesse, because that as yet there resteth some small traces of a Church in the Papacie, and that the substance of Baptisme still remaineth there: as also that the efficacie of Baptisme dependeth not vpon him which administred the same: we confesse, that those which are baptized therein, haue no need of a second baptisme. Yet in the meane time, by reason of the corruptions that are therein, children cannot be presented thereunto without pollution.

ARNOVV.

If all that be true, the Sonne of God is not yet come into the world, 106. Sect.
 seeing that one of the principallest markes of his coming, is the destroying of Idols. Now if by their reckoning the Romish Church be idolatrous, idolatrie was neuer in such credit, nor was so farre spread abroad as it is now, nor neuer had larger limits then it hath and hath had since sine or fixe ages, from whence they deriue the beginning of the corruptions of the Church.

MOVLIN.

By the same reason I could proue, that there are no more vices nor errors in the world, because Iesus Christ is come into the world to take them away. *M. Arnoux* is but ill

seem in histories, if he beleeveth that Iesus Christ by his coming hath wholly expelled and removed idols: seeing that since Iesus Christs time vntill now there hath alwayes bene an infinite number of Idolaters, as in China, India, &c. And the Senate of Rome were Pagans and Idolaters 400, yeaes after Iesus Christ, as we may see by *Symmachus Epistles*. Reade Revelation 9. 20. and you shall see that the Spirit of God foreteweth, that men did not repent of the seruice which they did to Idols. This prophesie is not against vs, which neither adore Idols, Images, Relicks, nor Sacraments, but adore God onely, Father, Sonne, and holy Ghost, and eleuate our hearts and adorations vp to heauen where Christ sitteth at the right hand of God: neither do we cut off the second Commandement from the Law of God, wherein the seruice of Images is prohibited.

The aduersarie is likewise misadvised to presume that the Church of Rome is not Idolatrous, because it hath a precinct largely extended. Pagans and Infidels, which are manifest idolaters, haue much greater territories. The Church is a little flocke, Luke 12. 32. The gate is narrow which goeth in to life eternall, and few there be which find it, Mat. 7. 14. All the earth followeth the Beast, Revel. 13. 4.

ARNOV.

207. 3a.

They note no places at all. This period of wrongs offered to the spouse of the Lambe, hath no proofe in the Scriptures.

MOVLIN.

Our Confession saith, that the pure word of God is banished out of the Papists assemblies. To proue it, it is not possible to alledge any places out of the Scripture: for the Scripture speaketh neither of Pope nor Papacie (vnlesse by way of prophesie.) It containeth not an historie of corruptions happened since the Apostles time, but onely speaketh of rules how to shun those corruptions. Adde hereunto, that every error of the Papacie whereby the pure word of God is corrupted,

ripped, is confuted by the places noted vpon the margents of our Confession; and it was not necessarie nor possible to put all the places which are noted vpon the other Articles in the margent of this 28. Article.

Touching the title of the spouse of the Lambe, which *M. Arnon* giueth to the Church of Rome, it agreeth ill with that which *Ballarmine* saith, lib. 1. cap. 9. *De Pontifice Rom.* where he saith, That the Pope is the spouse and head of the Church, *Christo seclusa*, Iesus Christ being excluded or set aside. This excellent title, properly belongeth to the Church of the elect, and so is this word taken, *Reuel. 21. 9.* And if by analogie this title be communicated to the visible Church, it belongs not to a particular Church to attribute the same vnto her selfe aboue all others; and much lesse to the Church of Rome, whereof the head, *Reu. 17. 15.* is described by a woman cloathed in scarlet, which sitteth in that Citie which hath seuen hills, which maketh the kings of the earth drunke: whereof it is foreshewed, that he shall call himselfe God, and that he shall worke signes and wonders, *2. Thess. 2.* And his doctrine is noted, to wit, the forbidding of meates and marriage, *1. Tim. 4. 3.* Reade ouer all the histories, and runne ouer all the earth, and see if you can find any other then the Pope of Rome, to whom these markes belong.

§. Ac ne forte. Perfectio si Ecclesia quæ est in terra, Christo seclusa, non ineptè comparatur sponsa, seclusa etiam Christus unum caput habere debet.

ARNOV.

On the contrary, the Prophets in all places promise the Church which was pure from errors in the beginning, perennance in her integrity.

108. Sect.

MOVLIN.

That is not so. The Prophets say no such thing: you should alledge those places: for the Prophets knew well that the Church of Israel which was pure in the beginning, became idolatrous in Egypt, *Ezech. 20. 7. 8.* They knew well that the children of Israel had worshipped the golden Calf, *Exod. 32.* himselfe the high Priest participating with them in the same sinne. They knew well that in the time of the Judges, the

people of Israel many times left the service of God to follow idolatrie. They knew that in the times of *Abas* and *Manasser*, idolatrie was erected in every towne, and that *Vrias* the high Priest erected an idolatrous altar in the Temple, 2. Kings 16. The Churches of Ierusalem and of Antiochia were pure in their beginning, and established, the one by Iesus Christ, the other by Saint *Peter*; and yet the Church of Rome holdeth that they are corrupted. Why may not the like happen to the Church of Rome, which is but a particular Church, which swalloweth vp the rest, and hath no particular promise that it shall never erre, but rather threatnings to be cut off, if she perseuer not in the bountifullnesse of God? Rom. 11. 22.

ARNOVV.

It is therefore with the eyes of affection that the Ministers look upon the catholike Church, and not with the eyes of ancient faith, which makes vs know the same by infallible signes, as by antiquitie contrary to noveltie, by succession contrary to interruption: by vniuersallitie contrary to singlinitie of number: by vniuersallitie contrary to diuision: and by continuance of doctrine contrary to licentiousnesse and impietie.

MOVLIN.

All this hath bene examined before in the 95. Section and the rest of the Sections following, where we haue shewed, that not one of these markes belong to the Church of Rome.

Of Licentiousnesse and prophane life.

110. Sect.

Touching Licentiousnesse and impietie, wherewith *M. Arnoxx* vphraideth those Churches that are separated from the Church of Rome, therein he speaketh against his owne conscience. For he knowes well, that in this point the Church of Rome beares away the bell for prophane life and impietie, from all the Churches in the world. I speake

not of particular persons, among whom I doubt not but that there are many that liue with ciuill honestie, and which thinke that in their religion they do seruice to God. I speake onely of publike orders. For in all other Churches, vices are accounted euils and corruptions, but in the Church of Rome vices are accounted vertues, and are become lawes. None but the Church of Rome teacheth periurie, which by a decree of a Councell, declareth that men are not bound to keepe faith and promise with heretickes: and which teacheth that the Pope can dispense with oathes made to God.

None but the Church of Rome, by publike order, hath established the Stewes, and by law permitted fornication.

None but the Church of Rome, giueth remission of sinnes vpon condition to do euill, and which maketh the grace of God to be a reward of disloyaltie and wickednesse. So whilest the last warres of the League in France continued, the Pope gaue nine yeares of pardon to all those French-men that should reuolt from the obedience of the King. Those pardons were set vp vpon church-doores, and on the corners of the streets.

None but the Church of Rome, maketh God an example of iniustice and of deceitfull reuenge, in this, that they teach that God pardoneth mens faults, but not the punishment for them, quitting our debt, but not the payment of the debt. For so he that shall haue receiued any iniurie, and hath pardoned the partie that did it, may, after pardon giuen, bereuenged on him, and say, that he did pardon his offence, but not the punishment of the offence. For, why will they haue a man to be more iust and mercifull then God? We are too much inclined to do euill, without being incited thereunto by the example of God.

None but the Church of Rome, giueth way to crueltie, teaching that he is not a murderer which with zeale to the holy mother Church of Rome, killeth one that is excommunicated, which is Pope *Urban's* doctrine, in the Canon *Excommunicatorum, Causa 23. Quest. 5.*

None but the Church of Rome dispenseth with subjects

* This is to be seene in the 19. Sessio of the Councell of Constance.

oathes of Allegiance to their Kings and which inciteth them to rebellion when it hath pleased the Pope to pronounce sentence of Deposition against a King. Whereof there is a Canon and a Rule in the Councell of Latran, vnder Innocent the third, Canon 3. And the Councell of Constance praised the same against *Fredericke* Duke of Austria in the twentieth Session.

ordand
in ordand
Sicut et in
ordand

* *De iuramentis*
sacerdot. Cap. 1.
In dictione
sacramenti
debet accusari
patrem; in
crimine laesa
maiestatis, &
in crimine
haereticis.

Suares in his
book against
the King of
great Brit-
taine, li. 6. c. 4.
saith, that the
lawful succet-
sor of a King
which is de-
posed by the
Pope, ought
to kill that
King.

* *Officiales*
ad preces
sanctissimi Do-
mini nostri
iustis sacra-
mentis scrip-
turae praestito-
rum corporale
instrumentum.

None but the Church of Rome dispenseth with children to be disobedient and to leave the subiection to their fathers and mothers commanded by the Law of God, when against their fathers and mothers will they save themselves, and enter into a Monasterie as into a Sanctuary of rebellion. Reade Numbers 20. 4. 5. 6. where the wives of a daughter, made contrary to her fathers will, are declared voyde and of no force.

None but the Church of Rome permitteth Doctors, by word of mouth and by writing, to maintaine that it is lawfull to vse equivocation in Justice, and that confessions of enterprises against the liues of Kings and Princes ought not to be revealed, and that it is lawfull for a sonne to accuse his father, and to procure his death, if he be an hereticke.

None but the Church of Rome selleth sacred things, and prayers for the dead, and maketh open trafficke of Benefices and Ecclesiasticall functions.

None but the Church of Rome suffereth a man which calleth himselfe Head of the Church, to weare the Crosse of Christ vpon his shoe, and to lay the holy Scripture at his feete when he commeth into Councells. The practise wherof was seene in the first Session of the last Councell of Latran.

None but the Church of Rome permitteth fables to be read, and forbiddeth the reading of the holy Scriptures.

If I would display and set forth what is done in Rome, from whence these rules come, and shew how vices against nature are there become naturall; how men there burne those which beleeeue that there is no other Head of the vniuersall Church but Iesus Christ, no other Purgatorie then his.

his blood, nor other propitiatorie Sacrifice then his death; and where neuertheless they let the Iewes live in peace, which affirme Iesus Christ to be a deceiver; and which for money buy libertie to blaspheme; it were an easie matter to make long and true discourses vpon this subject, and yet to say nothing but from the Popes themselves; and from the writers in the Romane Church, which make the like complaints.

And I say that the vices of other Churches are more tolerable then the vertues of the Romish Church, seeing that vertues there are degenerated into outward shewes, and pietie into a scrupulous deuotion: as also that there they presume to do greater numbers of workes, and such as are perfecter then God hath commanded, in such sort that God is debter to men, and is bound to make them restitution. For God easlier beareth with sinnes for which men repent, then with righteousness proudly presumed on.

Seeing also, that in stead of framing men to a voluntarie obedience, and to a filiall loue by the knowledge of the loue which God beareth vnto vs, she inciteth men to good works by the feare of a fire prepared for the children of God in Purgatorie, planting in their spirits a trembling pietie, and a seruile feare, in stead of a filiall loue; and to be short, a repentance whereof they must repent.

Of Saint Peters Supremacie.

ARNOV.

Contrarie places of Scripture. I say vnto thee, that thou art Peter, and vpon this stone I will build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not preuaile against it. III. Sect.

By this place, first the Sonne of God assigneth some recompence to the notable and excellent confession of the Apostle, who first afore all others acknowledged the naturall Sonne of God.

MOVLIN.

Others before Saint Peter made that confession, as Nathanael, John 1. 49. *Thou art that Sonne of God, thou art that King of Israel.* And all the Apostles knew that Iesus Christ was the Sonne of God, having heard the voice of God speaking from heaven, saying, *This is my welbelovèd Sonne, heare him.* It was not by his owne naturall sense but by diuine reuelation, that Peter acknowledged Iesus to be the Sonne of God; as Iesus Christ himselfe said vnto him in the same place, *Flesh and blood haue not reuealed it vnto thee, but my Father which is in heauen.*

This promise therefore which the Lord made vnto him in this place, is an augmentation of graces, and not a recompence for merits.

ARONVX.

112. Sect.

Secondly, this recompence is giuen to none other but to him to whom onely he addressed himselfe with all the circumstances which in any sort may make a discourse individual.

MOVLIN.

I answer with Saint Augustine, in the 118. Tractate vpon Saint Iohn, That Saint Peter spake that for all the Apostles, and receiued that for them all, as representing vnitie in his person: and with Saint Ambrose, vpon the 38. Psalme: *Quod Petro dicitur, Apostolis dicitur.* That which was said to Saint Peter was said to the Apostles. And our Aduersaries confesse that the keyes of the kingdome of heauen were giuen to all the Apostles. Whereby it followeth, that Iesus Christ in this place promising to giue the keyes to Saint Peter, promised them also to the rest of the Apostles. For he spake not vnto them of the keyes, but in that place onely.

ARONVX.

113. Sect.

Thirdly, the recompence which he assigned vnto him, is a dignitie of prebeminence, seeing he saith, that he is the corner stone of the foundation whereon all the house dependeth.

MOVLIN.

MOVLIN. In this place Iesus Christ giueth not any power to *Peter*, but onely maketh a promise thereof. And that which he here promised, he giueth and conferreth it actually vpon him, Ioh. 20. 22. 23. where Iesus Christ speaketh thus to all the Apostles, saying, *As my Father sent me, so send I you. Whose finnes sooner ye remis, they are remitted unto them, and whose finnes sooner ye retaine, they are retained.* So in the actuall conferring of the power which he had promised, he made the Apostles equall. As also Mat. 18. 18. he speaketh thus to all his Apostles, *Verily I say vnto you: whatsoever ye binde on earth, shall be bound in heauen, and whatsoever ye loose on earth shall be loosed in heauen.*

And it is to be noted; that after that promise made to Saint *Peter*, the Apostles stroue among themselves for the superioritie, which they would not haue done, if they had vnderstood, that by those words the Lord had promised the superioritie to *Peter*; and would not haue withstood the commandement of the Lord. But *M. Ananias* hath a conceit, that he vnderstandeth Iesus Christs words better then the Apostles did. Also it is false, that Iesus Christ did declare Saint *Peter* to be the corner stone of the Church. He saith not, *Super is Petrum*, but, *Super hunc Petrum*: he saith not, *Vpon thee Peter*, but, *vpon this stone*, which is cleare in the Greeke, where it is said: *ἐπὶ τῆς πέτρας*, and not *ἐπὶ τὸν τῆς πέτρας*. For *πέτρας* in Greeke also signifieth a stone: and so the allusion had had a good grace. But the holy Ghost guiding Saint *Matthew* pen, thought it better to lose the grace of that allusion, then to let vs stumble at that ambiguity.

And certainly the Church of God is not grounded vpon a mortall man; it was a Church before *S. Peter* was, and at Saint *Peters* comming it altered not the foundation. And Saint *Peter* being dead, the Church must of force haue changed her foundation, and thereby haue bene much impaired. We are grounded vpon the same foundation whereon Saint *Peter* was grounded, but he was not grounded vpon himselfe. And if it be so, that the Church spoken of in this place should be the Church of the elect, if Saint *Peter* was the foundation of the

the elect, he was also the foundation of the election. Now it appeareth that here the Scripture speaketh of the Church of the elect; because Iesus Christ saith, that the gates of hell, that is, the power of the diuell, should not preuaile against it, and by consequence that neither the diuell, nor hell can cast any one of those which are of the Church, into hell. Which cannot agree with the vniuersall visible Church; whereof Satan seduceth many: against the which the Beast shall make warre, and overcome it. Our aduersaries themselves say, that Antichrist shall abolish the Masse; and therefore he shall preuaile against the Church of Rome.

Apocal. 13. 7.

Not that I denie, that Saint Peter may be called the foundation of the visible Church; so that by Saint Peter we vnderstand his doctrine, in which sence the Fathers vnderstand it. But also in this sence all the Apostles equally are foundations of the Church: as it is said, Ephes. 2. 20. And are built vpon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Iesus Christ himselfe being the chiefe corner stone. Note these words *him selfe*, expressly set downe to discern Iesus Christ from the Apostles; which are not foundations *themselves*, but in their doctrine.

Then this fundamentall stone is Iesus Christ, confessed by Saint Peter: for Iesus Christ is commonly called the stone. As 1. Cor. 10. 4. *The rock was Christ*. And Psal. 118. 22. *Blay, 28. 16. Rom. 9. 33.* and in many other places. So Saint Augustine vnderstands it in his tenth Treatise vpon the first of S. Iohn, saying. *What meaneth this, For this stone I will build my Church? Upon this faith, vpon that which hath bene said, Then art thou Christ, the Son of the living God.* Reads also his 30. and 22. Treatise vpon Saint Iohn. And his 13. Sermon vpon the words of our Lord, where he effectually insisteth thereupon. And S. Hilarie in his sixt booke of the Trinitie: *Vpon this stone of the Confession the Church is built.* Chrysostome in his 55. Homilie vpon the 16. of Saint Matthe. saith: *Vpon this stone, that is, vpon the faith of the Confession.* And in his Sermon of Pentecost, He said: *Vpon this stone, and not vpon Peter. For he built not the Church vpon man, but vpon the faith.* See S. Ambrose also vpon the second to the Ephesians.

Super hanc
confessionem
petram Eccle-
sia edificatio-
est.
Vbi tuus es
vbi tuus es
vbi tuus es
vbi tuus es
vbi tuus es
vbi tuus es
vbi tuus es
vbi tuus es
vbi tuus es
vbi tuus es

of

Of Saint Peters Successors.

ARNOVX.

This dignitie which cannot die with Saint Peter, is necessarily transferred to his successors, for that God neuer changed the forme of the government, once established by diuine right. 114. Sect.

MOVLIN.

If Saint Peter had not the dignitie to be the chiefe corner stone of the Church, as we haue already shewed, he had no successors in a dignitie which he had not.

But put the case that Saint Peter had bene the head and the foundation of the vniuersall Church, doth it from thence follow, that he had a successor in that dignitie? Moses was by God established to be the Prince, Law-giuer, and Priest in Israel, but left no successor, because God had not so ordained it. Saint Iohn Baptist had no successor. The rest of the Apostles had no successors in their Apostleship; why then should Saint Peter haue a successor in his? seeing that God in his Law did not ordaine it to be so? and that Saint Peter in his second Epistle which he wrote vnto the vniuersall Church, doth not will Christians to acknowledge the Bishop of Rome for his successor? Was there euer any kingdome or soueraigntie temporall or spirituall established in the world without lawes made touching the succession thereof, and touching the forme of chusing or succeeding? Here we haue no such thing, nor no declaration of the will of God vpon this matter.

Add hereunto, that if Saint Peter was established head of the vniuersall Church, it was then when it was little, and compounded of a small number of men, which order could not be obserued when the Church began to spread it selfe abroad through out all the world. There are no one mans shoulders strong enough for so great a burthen. It would make a
mans

mans head giddie to be lifted vp so high.

And if after *Saint Peters* death, there had bene necessitie to haue a successor in the office of the head of the vniuersall Church, I make all men Iudges, that haue any sparke of free iudgement, whether that office ought not of right to appertaine to *Saint Iohn* or *Saint Iames*, whom *Saint Paul*, Galat. 2. calleth *pillars*, and which outliued *Saint Peter* a long time, rather then to deferre it to *Linus* *Saint Pauls* disciple, of whom we know nothing but the name: or to *Clement*, who saith in his * Epistles, That mens goods and women ought to be common, and * that fourth marriages are manifest fornication?

* Can. Dilectissimis Cassa. 12. Quasi. 2. Lib. 3. Constit. Apost. cap. 2. Id quod supra trigamiam sit manifesta fornicatio indicatur.

At the least, it had bene reason, and verie requisite, to haue done those excellent Apostles that honour to haue called them, and to haue askt their aduice touching the choise of a head of the vniuersall Church. Who will beleuee that the people of the Citie of Rome had the credit, of their owne authoritie to giue a head to the Church of all the world, and that during the liues of the Apostles, and without making them acquainted therewith?

Especially after the death of all the Apostles, when by the witnesse of all Antiquitie, Bishops, and specially the Bishops of Rome, were chosen by the voices of the people of the Citie: could the people of Rome giue a head to the Churches of Asia, Egypt, Persia, and the Indies, without acquainting them with it? No man will beleuee it, but he that hath a mind to be deceiued.

If *Saint Peter* was at Rome, and there erected the Church and the Bishopricke, as they say, the Bishop of Rome may be called *Saint Peters* successor, but not in the quality of an Apostle or head of the vniuersall Church, but in qualitie of the Bishop of the Citie of Rome, which is the highest qualitie which the ancient Bishops of Rome rooke on them in their Epistles. And yet this succession ceaseth when the doctrine begins to be corrupt.

M. Arment about the end of his booke, to support the Popes supremacie, alledgeth a place out of the third booke of

Irenaeus,

Irenæus, cap. 3. but falsified and corrupted according to his manner. He maketh *Irenæus* say, that it is absolutely necessarie, that all the Church should agree, and adhere to the Church of Rome, wherein the preheminance of principality resideth. This place is falsly alledged, *M. Arunus* hath added the word *adhere*, which is not in *Irenæus*. Also he translateth the word *conuenire*, to agree, whereas it signifieth to arrive, or come from diuerse parts to one place. To this falshood of words he addeth a corruption of the sence. For *Irenæus* by this principall preheminance vnderstandeth the power of the Citie of Rome, because it was the Imperiall seate, and not the supremacy of the Bishop or of his Church. He would say, that because of the Imperiall seate, and of the Senate, Christians from all places of necessitie came thither. This is the place as it is in *Irenæus*, It is necessarie that all Churches should come hither to this Church, because of the soueraigne power, that is, the power of the Empire. Which is the reason why the 9. Canon of the Councell of Antiochia ordained that the Bishops of great Cities should have preheminance. Because (saith the Councell) that all those that haue any businessse come to the Metropolitane Citie; therefore it hath bene ordained, that the Bishop thereof should haue a preheminance of honour. For that cause therefore the Church of Alexandria went before that of Antiochia, although the Church of Antiochia was the ancienter, and founded by Saint Peter, because that among the Cities of the Romane Empire, Alexandria according to ciuill order was the second next to Rome. The 17. Canon of the Councell of Chalcedon speaketh expressely thereof, when it is ordained, that the order of Ecclesiasticall Dioceses should be accommodated according to ciuill and publike forme. Following that order, the 630. Bishops assembled at that Councell; ordained that the bishopricke of Constantinople should haue the same prerogatives that the ancient Imperiall bishopricke of Rome had; and that it should be as much honoured as Rome in Ecclesiasticall affaires; as being the second Citie in rankes after Rome.

Ad hanc Ecclesiam propter potentior principalem necessitate est omnium conuenire Ecclesiam.

ἵνα τὸ ἐν τῇ μετروπόλει συναχθέν πᾶν τὸ πρῶτον ἵκεται ἰσχυρῶς ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ ἀρχιεπισκοπῇ.

ἵνα ἡ ἀρχιεπισκοπὴ ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ ἀρχιεπισκοπῇ.

Of the perpetuity of the Church.

ARNOV.

115. *Soft.*

Such an house of God founded upon this stone, hath for an infallible marke, that it shall neuer be shaken, and that the gates of hell, that is to say, heresies and persecutions shall haue no power against it. Thus if there be any other Church which enuyeth this priuledge of a perpetuall interruption and a succession neuer broken, let them shew it vs. If there be not, let them pull this place out of their Bibles, or deface their Article, which stroweth against the Church of Rome, dissolueth the promise of the Sonne of God.

MOVLIN.

If by Succession our Aduersarie vnderstandeth a succession of persons without succession of doctrine, this succession is nothing, but rather a corruption then a succession. Such (by the iudgement of the Church of Rome) is the succession of the Greeke Church, which hath continued from the Apostles time, and yet continueth, and is ancients then the Church of Rome. But if by perpetuall Succession he vnderstandeth a line of succession of men perseuering in the same doctrine, this succession doth not in any manner belong to the Church of Rome. The latter Bishops of Rome, are nothing like the first, and it seemeth that the last are expressly risen vp to condemne the first. In the first age of the Church, were the Bishops of Rome temporall Princes? Did they weare a Regall Crowne? Did they take vpon them to depose Emperors and Kings? Did they draw soules out of Purgatorie? Did they giue pardons for seuen or eight hundred thousand yeares? Did they allow adoration of Images? Did they prohibit to glue the cup to the people, and to reade the Scriptures? Did they say Seruice in an vnknown tongue? Did they worship the host with diuine worship called Latria? Did they call vpon Saints? Did they paint the Trinity? Did they call the virgin

gine *Mary* Queene of heauen? These are smarting sores, which none of the aduersaries dare once touch, nor undertake to produce a place of antiquity for any of these points. Therefore our aduersaries haue but little cause to boast of perpetuallitie, after they haue made a new religion, and by consequence a new Church.

Neuerthelesse, say that the Church of Rome had continued ever since the Apostles time, doth it follow that perpetuall continuance of the Romish Church, is a marke of her puritie? Is the latter day yet come? Will *M. Arnaux* warrant it from this time vntill then from subuersion? A thing cannot be called perpetuall which hath not continued vnto the end. This Doctor giues vs his future hopes, for present marks of the Church. Besides there are diuers false Churches which haue continued from Christs time, and still continue to this day,

Of the Idolatrie of the Romish Church, and in how many sorts the Church of Rome is Idolatrous, and what Idolatrie is.

The 28. Article of our Confession saith, that in the Church of Rome *all superstitions and idolatries are permitted*. This accusation is of no small moment, seeing that, 1. Cor. 6. 9. the Apostle saith, that *Idolaters shall not inherit the kingdome of heauen*. Therefore we cannot intreate of a matter of more importance, because it concernes saluation, and exclusion out of the kingdome of heauen. If the word *Idolatrie* doth offend our aduersaries, we would haue them to consider, that we cannot call things otherwise then the word of God calleth them; and also to beleue, that our intent is not thereby to offend them, but to make them know and feele their owne euill: which cannot be done by flattering them, or by disguising the truth: and that if they be offended at this which we say of them, God is much more offended at that which they do vnto him. And if for propounding the word of God vnto them, they hate vs, we neuerthelesse will not cease to take

116. *Sabb.*

com-

compassion on them, and lend them our helping hands; at least to discharge our owne consciences.

I say that in fixe things the Church of Rome committeth idolatry. First, by adoring the host which the Priest holdeth in his hands, and calling that God which is not so. Secondly, by attributing that honour to Saints which onely appertaineth to God; by calling vpon them, by making them mediators, by asking saluation of God by their merits, and by believing that they know the hearts and thoughts of men. Thirdly, by calling the virgine *Mary* the inuestrix of grace, Queene of heaven, and Lady of the world: for the Royaltie and Empire over all creatures belongeth to God onely. Fourthly, by the adoration and worshipping of images. Fifthly, by adoring the crosse. And sixthly, by worshipping the bones, apparell, and other reliques of the dead. The first sort of idolatry shall be spoken of in the end of this worke. The second and third sort hath bene declared and discoursed on at large in the 24 Article of our Confession. There remaine the three last, that is, adoration of images, of the crosse, and of reliqs. Vpon all which in generall we say, that we call those idolaters which yeeld a worship and religious seruice to creatures, or that partly or wholly transport to creatures that honour which is due to God. By which definition it appeareth, that the most holy and most excellent creatures may be transformed into idols by those that are superstitious: so farr, as that ancient Christians called the Arrians idolaters, because denying Iesus Christ to be the eternall and soueraigne God, neuertheless they called on him, and yeelded religious seruice vnto him: From whence it followeth, that those which honour Saints with such honours whereby God is dishonoured, do wrong the Saints by honouring them, seeing that as much as in them lyeth, they transforme them into idols.

Of the words Image and Idoll. And of the Hebrew words Pesel and Tenuab, which God useth in the Law.

Before

Before we proceed further, you must understand the words: Image is a Latine word, and Idoll is a Greeke word; both the one and the other in their first originall, and as they are taken and vnderstood by good and ancient Authors, signifie resemblance and representation. *Tertullian* a great Doctor touching signification of words, collecth all figures and representations *Idols*, in the third chapter of his booke of Idolatrie. *Idos* ^a in the Greeke signifieth a forme or representation, from whence the diminutive *Idolon* is deriued, which signifieth a little forme or figure, and therefore every figure or forme should be called *Idol*. *Cicero* likewise in his first booke *De finibus* saith, ^b Images which they call *Idoles*, by meeting with whom we both see and thinke: Taking Image and Idoll for one thing. *Chrysostome* in his tenth Homilie vpon the third chapter of the Epistle to the Philippians saith, ^c We beautifie and set out our houses, by placing *Idols* and Images in them. And *Xiphilius* the Abridger of *Dion*, in the life of *Seneca*, in stead of saying that there was an Image or figure of waxe at the funerall pompe of the Emperour *Pertinax* representing the dead Emperour, he saith, ^d That there was an *Idoll* of waxe triumphantly adorned. In all these places and infinite others, Image and Idoll signifie one selfe same thing, and the word Idoll is taken in good part, and simply signifieth a resemblance or representation. Reade *Isidore* in his eight booke of *Originals*, cap. *De Dijs Gentium*.

Therefore *Iohannes Molanus* appointed to be Censor and Examiner of the Nomenclator of *Adrian Iunius*, vpon the chapter of the Toolles or Moueables of the Church, giueth this censure, saying, The Nomenclator hath not done amisse to take the words statue, carued representation, Image, Idoll, and figure, all for one thing. Neuerthelesse, the Reu. derought to remeember, that some of these words, by the vse of the Scripture, and Ecclesiasticall Authors, are taken in euill part.

These words therefore in their proper signification, signifie all one thing. But common vse hath restrained the signification of the word *Idoll*, in such sort that now it is taken in

17. Sect.
a *Idos* Græcè
formulam (a-
nat, ab eo di-
minutium *I-*
dolum dedu-
ctum, æque
apud nos for-
mulam facit:
Igitur omnis
forma vel for-
mula *idolum*
dici exposcit.
b *Imagines*
quæ *idola* no-
minant, quo-
rum incurio-
na non solum
videamus sed
etiam cogite-
mus.
c *ὁμοιω* na-
τουρῶν ἰδὼ
idola οὗτοι
ἔχουσιν
εἰδωλῶν
d *ὁμοιω* τῶν
πρωτοτύπων
οὗτοι ἰδωλῶν
ὡς ἀποκρί-
νεται.

will part: and in the new Testament written in Greeke the word *Idoll* is taken for the Image of a false god, or for an Image which men do abuse unto idolatrie. From whence it followeth, that he should be thought to speake amisse, that should say that Iesus Christ is the *Idoll* of the invisible God; in stead of saying, the Image; or that should say, that God made man according to his *Idoll* or likeness. In this sence, and according to the common vse, Image is more generally vsed then *Idoll*, and every *Idoll* is an Image, but every Image is not an *Idoll*.

The words by the which God in his Law forbiddeth vs to make any *graven Image*, or the *likenesse* of any things which are in heauen above or in the earth below, are *Pesel* and *Themunnab*; whereof the last signifieth every Image and resemblance, but the first signifieth a graven Image or figure: and is not taken in euill part, but when the sence and circumstance of the place constraines vs to take it for an Image forbidden, and which is abused to Idolatrie. Therefore the word *Pesel* by the Greeke Interpreters is translated *γάρυον*, which signifieth a carued or graven Image, as in the first verse of the 26. Chapter of *Leuiticus*, and *Deuter.* chap. 4. 16. 25. and chap. 5. 8. and in many other places, and sometime *ἰδωλον*, *Idolum*, as *Exod.* chap. 20. 4. sometime *εἰκων*, which signifieth Image and resemblance, as *Esay* chapter. 40. 18. 30. The Romish translation ordinarily translateth *Pesel*, *sculpture*; that is, a graven Image, and also an Image or representation, specially in these places alledged out of *Exodus*, *Leuiticus*, *Deuteronomie*, and *Esay*.

Our Adversaries, which make a controuersie about these words, thereby to hinder the examination of things, will haue men to translate the second Commandement of God in this manner; *Thou shalt make no graven Idoll, nor any resemblance of things which are in heauen, &c.* and say, that *Idoll* is the resemblance of a thing which is not, but that Image is the representation of a thing which is; wherein they contradict their owne Bible. These are the very words whereby this commandement is set downe, *Deut.* 5. 8. in the French Bible.

Bible translated in Louaine, and approved by the Facultie of Divines there: *Thou shalt make no graven representation, nor any likensse whatsoever, of that which is in heaven, &c.* And in Deuter. 4. 16. *To the end, lest peradventure being deceived, you should make to your selves a graven similitude, or the Image of male or female:* And Elay. 20. 18. *Towhom then have you likened God, and what Image do you set for him?* In which places the word *Pesel*, which our Aduersaries would haue translated, *a graven Idoll*, is translated in our Aduersaries Bible, *resemblance, Image, and graven representation.* And their Latin Bible hath, *Non facies tibi sculptile: Thou shalt not make any carved or graven Image.*

And whereas in this Commandement they will haue *Idoll* to signifie the representation of a thing that is not, it proceedeth from a voluntarie blindness; for the words following, *Nor resemblance of thing which are in heauen, &c.* shew, that God speaketh of the Images of things which are. It is true, that 1. Cor. 10. 19. 20. saith, that the *Idoll* is nothing because it is no diuine thing, but onely wood or stone; but that may also be said of the Images of things which are, and that become *Idols* when religious seruice is attributed vnto them. And it is certaine, that although the Sunne and the Moone are fixed and seene, yet to adore the Sunne and the Moone, is Idolatrie.

Of the Images of God, and of the Trinitie.

The Temples of the Romish Church are full of Images of the Trinitie; they paint an old man sitting in a chaire, apparelled like a Pope, with a Papall triple crowne, and a robe, to the end (it may be) that he should be respected because of his clothes. They also make a Pigeon hanging at his beard, and a Crucifixe in his armes. Such pictures are printed at the beginnings or titles of the Bibles printed at Rome, by authority of the Popes, Sixtus the fifth and Clement the eight. They also serue for Signes for Alehouses and Innes, which is a common thing in Paris: where they say, *Monsieur is lodged*

118. Set.

as the Trinity, and his men at Gods head, making a derision of the diuine nature. The title of the 8. chap. of *Beles* booke of Images, is, *That the Images of God are not forbidden*. That seemes to be done, to render to God as much as he hath done for vs. For seeing that God hath made man according to his Image; man, in recompence; makes God according to mans Image.

a Cur tandem
Patrem Domini
Iesu Christi
non oculis
subijcimus ac
pingimus?
Quoniam quis
sic non nouimus,
Dei; natura spe-
ctanda pro-
poni non pos-
t est ac pingi.
b Imagines
Patris & Spi-
ritus Sancti
effigiant quod
perquam ab-
surdum est.
c Quosdam
qui in finibus
Bohemia atq;
Austria su-
premam illum
maiestatem,
senis, adoles-
centis, colum-
bae imagine
pingebant,
lata religio-
nis accersitis,
Anthropo-
morphitas esse
renunciatis,
quosdam ad
excessum con-
damnauit.

This error is of late times crept into the Church of Rome, by the conuience of an obscure age, wherein the holy Scriptures being taken away, the people had no other knowledge of God then that which was given them in Pictures. The second Councell of Nice, wherein it is ordained that Images should be adored, exempteth the Images of God; as a thing whereof as then they spake not. *Baronius* in the 726 yeare of his *Annales* speaketh of two Epistles written by Pope *Gregorie* the 2. a great defender of Images; in the first whereof he saith, that they painted the Sonne but not the Father; saying, *Why do we not set before mens eyes and paint the Father of our Lord Iesus Christ? Because we know not what he is; and the nature of God cannot be painted nor set forth to mens sight*. Whereupon *Baronius* noteth in the margin, that since that time they haue vsed to paint God in Churches; and found it requisite so to do, against that Popes determination. *Nicephorus* a new Author, in *libr. 8. cap. 52.* saith, *The Armenian heretickes paint the Image of God the Father, and of the holy Ghost, which is most absurd. Auentius. libr. 7.* of the *Bauctian* historie saith, that Pope *Iohn* the 22. which liued in anno 1318. calleth certaine men that dwelt in Bohemia and Austria, *Anthropomorphites*, (that is, men which thought God to haue humane shape and members) because they painted the diuine maiestie in forme of an old man, with a yong man and a pigeon; and condemned them to be burnt. And among the new doctors of the Romish Church, *Durand*, *Abulenſis*, and *Persinus*, condemne those Images, and will not haue the Image of the Trinity to be painted in any manner.

Against this abomination we haue a formall commandement

ment in the first Table of the Law of God, according to our Adversaries translation: *Thou shalt not make unto thy selfe any graven representation, or likenesse what soever of that which is in heauen, &c.* Deut. 5. 8. Could he more expressly forbid the making of the likenesse of God which is in heauen? And in the 4. of Deut. 17. 16. it is said, *Take ye therefore good heed vnto your selues, (for ye saw no manner of similitude on the day that the Lord spake vnto you in Horeb out of the midst of the fire) lest ye corrupt your selues, and make you a graven Image; the similitude of any figure, the likenesse of male or female.* And in Esay 40. 18. *To whom then will you liken God, or what likenesse will you compare vnto him?* In all these places it is formally forbidden to make any resemblance of God, or to represent him by Images, and that according to the translation receiued in the Church of Rome, as also in the Hebrew text.

2. Therefore, neither in the ancient Tabernacle, nor in Salomons temple, was there any picture or Image of God, although it was then a time of shadows and figures.

3. The Apostle Saint Paul, Rom. 1. 23. among the causes for the which God blinded the Gentiles, placeth this for one, *Because they turned the glorie of the incorruptible God, into the similitude of the Image of a corruptible man.*

4. And without the word of God Reason it selfe is most euident and plaine against it: for euerie Image and representation, ought in some sort to resemble that which it representeth. Now what resemblance can an infinite Spirit haue with a peece of wood? an inuisible and immateriall substance, with a visible picture? or a Spirit without bodie, with a substantiall Image? What King will endure to haue his picture made like a Frog or an Ant? and yet the distance and difference betweene the greatest Monarch in the world and the least creature that is, is not infinite; for that both the one and the other are finite. But betweene God which is infinite, and a mortall creature, what excellencie soeuer it is, the distance and inequality is infinite. For this our Adversaries bring some slender excuses, not for an answer, but because they will not seeme to say nothing.

They say, that in representing of God, they intend not to represent his essence. But it is to no purpose to shew to what end men represent God by Images, seeing the commandment given by God not to represent him by Images, is generall and without exception. And it is certaine, that no man was ever so brutish, as to thinke he could represent the essence of God in a picture, seeing that it is impossible to paint the essence of a man or of the least beast that is. By this distinction then it may be said, that the prohibition which God so expressly maketh (with threatnings) not to represent him by any Image, is made to no body, seeing that no man ever went about to represent the essence of God. And there is no Pagan idolater but may excuse himselfe by this meanes.

6. They adde, that the Scripture attributeth feete, hands, eyes, and a mouth to God; and therefore that we may represent God in the same forme. This argument hath as good reason as if they should say, Because the Scripture in words maketh figures, let vs also make Images of stones; let vs paint God with wings, and in forme of a bird; or let vs paint him like a rocke, or like a fountaine, or like a Lion, because the Scripture saith that God couereth vs with the shadow of his wings, and calleth him our rocke, the fountaine of life, and compareth him to a Lion. This reason therefore is without reason: for the word of God which attributeth feete, hands, and eyes vnto God, expoundeth it selfe, and oftentimes elsewhere declareth, that God is a Spirit, and that he is infinite. But the Images of God expound not themselves, and there are no other Images that speake to prevent the error and the grosse conceit. The people of God, and all the Patriarkes and Prophets vnderstood not this subtilty; for from those figuratiue words whereby God spake vnto them, they drew no such strange consequence, neither tooke any liberty thereby to erect Images to God.

7. The reason ensuing, which is that whereof they make the greatest shew, doth also make against themselves. They say, that God sometime appeared in forme of a man; as to *Daniel* in the forme of an old man. From whence they inferre, that

chat we may paint God in the same forme wherein he appeared. But they ought rather to reason thus, and to say that God appeared to *Daniel* in the forme of a man, and yet the Church at that time did not represent God in that forme, but obeyed the commandement of God, which forbiddeth them to corrupt themselves, by making unto God any Image either of male or female, Deut. 4. Therefore we ought to do as the Church at that time did, and obey the commandement of God. For here we argue not what God hath done, but what God will haue vs to do. The commandements and not the actions of God, are the rules of our liues. It is by his commandement and not by his apparitions that we shall be iudged at the latter day. It is mad religion to violate the commandement of God, and to counterfeit his actions: as if a man should despise the Law of God, and go about to counterfeit thunder. And I cannot find that God euer appeared in that forme wherein the Church of Rome represents him. He neuer appeared with a Miter with three Crownes, in a Popes robe, nor set in a Pontificall chaire.

8 *Bellarmino* was not ashamed to reason in this manner: God made man according to his Image: then we may make Images of God. But this Cardinall, which playes with God, and maketh a iest of his word, is not ignorant that man is created after the Image of God, because his soule is illuminated with knowledge, and his will adorned with righteousness and holinesse: those are the lineaments and prints of the Image of God. In this sence it is good and necessarie that man should frame himselfe after the Image of God. But from this, that God hath created man with righteousness and holinesse, to inferre, that man may paint God after the Image of man, is to haue more need of a Physition then of a teacher, and of purgation then of instruction.

*Lib. 2. de reli-
quijs & ima-
ginibus San-
ctorum, cap. 8.
§. Quinto.*

*Whether it be lawfull to set vpp pictures and Images of the
Saints that are dead in the Church, for aides and
helps of pietie and deuotion.*

119. *Satz.*

The Romish Churches are full of Images and pictures diuersly adorned and set forth; one with a sword; another with keyes; another with a hog, as *Saint Anthony*; another with a dog, as *Saint Roc*; another with rats and mice, as *Saint Radegund*; and those beasts also haue part of the incense, and are as much lighted with candles as the Saints themselves. *Saint Anthony* could not reade, yet ouer the gate of *Saint Anthony's Abbey*, not far from Paris, he is made with a booke in his hand. There are diuerse Images of Saints which are poorly clad: and there are manie Images of one Saint, one apparelled in silke laid on with lace of gold, and which oftentimes changeth his apparell; another dustie, and before whom they light not many candles. Hard by an image clothed in white damaske, you shall see one starke naked, which is the image of God. At the death of a Prince you shall see both he and she Saints clad in blacke, and our Lady enduring part of the affliction. They say, they are helpes in deuotion, yet they hide them in Lent time, which is the time of deuotion. They call them the hookes of the ignoram, but are no remedies against ignorance. Also there are many Images of Saints which neuer were in the world, & which are Saints and neuer were men. As the three Kings, *S. Longis*, *S. Ursula*, *Saint Catherine*, *Saint Margaret*, *S. Marciall*, *S. Christopher*, and the 11. thousand virgins, &c. And if an idoll be the Image of a thing which is not, it is certaine that such Images are idolls, and by consequent, those that serue them are idolaters.

The naturall inclination of man hath hatched this abuse; but the subtille and policie of the Bishop of Rome hath bene the nurse thereof. For naturally man loueth Images: even little children loue babies, specially if they be finely cloathed, and hauing set them in some eminent place, beare them I know not what respect. This childish humor hath crept into religion: and as babies are childrens idolls, so Images and pictures are mens babies. For in regard that all our knowledge cometh by sense, man desireth to see an object of sensible deuotion: and will haue something to bind or prouoke his attention. Wherunto also the pleasure of the eye and easinesse

inuiteth him. For it is an easier thing to see pictures then to comprehend doctrines; and to forme prayers to the Image of man, then to forme man to the Image of God.

Popes by their subtilty haue dexterously serued their turns with this inclination, to withdraw the light of the Scripture from the people, that in a darke night they might lay the foundation of their Empire. For the people did easily neglect instruction when they fed them with recreation, and were vsed to haue Images in stead of sacred bookes, pictures for doctrynes, and candles lighted at noone day, in stead of the light of the holy Scripture which drineth away the obfuscation of ignorance. And we see in Histories, that as fast as ignorance increased, Images also multiplied, and the Popes Empire was strengthened.

Against this permission to fill the Church with Images, we haue the commandement of God, which not only forbiddeth to serue Images or to worship them, but also to make them. For the first table of the Law is expressly made to order religion and the seruice of God. I say then, that in matter of religion God forbiddeth to make Images. The words are very direct: *Thou shalt not make to thy selfe any graven Image, nor the likenesse of any thing that is in heauen above, or in the earth below, or in the waters vnder the earth: Thou shalt not bow downe to them nor worship them.* There it is manifest, that in matter of religion and pietie, he forbiddeth two things; one to make any Image or likenesse of things that are in heauen or earth: the other to bow downe to them or worship them. He saith not, *Thou shalt make no graven Image to worship it*; but he saith, *Thou shalt make no graven Image, nor worship it*. For although the end for the which Images are forbidden in matter of religion, is for feare lest men should fall into idolatrie by worshipping them; yet God knowing that man is naturally giuen to idolatry, did not onely forbid the worship of Images, but also the making of them for any religious vse, and hath prohibited the means and inducements thereto for feare of the end. The like prohibition is made, *Leuit. 26. 1. Thou shalt make you no idols, nor graven Image, neither reare you up*

a standing Image, neither shall you set you up any Image of stone in your land to bow down to it. For I am the Lord your God.

Therefore also the Israelites in their Temple and in their Synagogues, had not the Images of Abraham, Jacob, Moses, Samuel, nor David; persons neuertheless which were of as much worth as S. Iamper, or S. Amador.

Irenæus lib. 1. cap. 23. and 24. saith, that the Gnostiques

a Etiam imagines quasdam depictas, quasdam de reliqua materia fabricatas, dicentes formam Christi scilicet à Pilato. b Colabant imagines Iesu et adorando & incensum ponendo.

Placuit in Ecclesiis picturas esse non debere, ne quod colitur aut adoratur in parietibus pingatur.

c Aug. de Consensu Evang. lib. 1. cap. 10. Sic omnia errare iussit, qui Christum & Apostolos eius non in sanctis codicibus, sed in parietibus quaerunt.

had certaine painted Images, and others made of other matter, saying that they were the figures of Christ made by Pilato.

On Saint Augustine in his booke of Heteries, cap. 7. speaking of the Carpocratians, saith, b They served the Images of Iesus, worshipping them; and offering incense vnto them. The Collyridians are blamed for the same by Epiphanius in his 79. Heteries: who also being at Anablata, tore a wile in a Church wherein there was a picture of Christ, or of some other Saint, saying that it was contrary to the authority of the Scriptures, as he reciteth in an Epistle translated by Saint Hierome, and which is found in the second Tome of the said S. Hieromes Epistles.

The 36. Canon of the Councell of Eliberia, held at the same time that the Councell of Nice was holden, saith thus: It hath bene ordained, that there should be no pictures in Churches, for scarce lest men should adore that which is painted upon the wall.

Our aduersaries reasons to the contrary are rather excuses and shifts then proofes. They say, that Images are the bookes of the ignorant; and they say true; for they maintaine ignorance. It is hard for them that haue chosen stones to be their teachers, to asaine to any instruction: as S. Augustine saith; c Thus they desire to be seduced, which haue sought Iesus Christ and his Apostles, not in the holy Scriptures, but in painted wallen. The bookes of the ignorant are good when they are a remedy of ignorance. Such are the sacred bookes of the old and new Testaments, which they hide from the people, lest they should instruct the ignorant. And it is not without a myserie, that in Lent, which is the time of preaching, they hide the Images, to shew that Images ought to

hide

Angels those Cherubims were figures? As also that the resemblance of Angels which are invisible and incorporeall, cannot be made in any corporall figure. Then we must say, that those Cherubims were not the Images of any Angels, but symboles and characters of their office, in the same manner as men paint vertues and vices. So we paint Enuie leane, Pride swolne and puff vp, Iustice with a sword and a paire of ballances. Which symbollicall pictures produced diuers Saints, as S. Christopher, S. Margarete, and S. George, which were not the Images of any Saints that euer liued in the world; but figures and characters of Christians and combats of faith, as Barrowus in his booke of Martyrs is oftentimes constrained to confesse.

Being put from these weake proofes, they alwayes returne to this, that we must translate, *Thou shalt make no graven idoll*, and not, *grauen Image*. But what need haue we to dispute hereof, seeing that the words following do awoyd the dispute? for God addeth, *Nor resemblance or similitude whatsoeuer*. These words cut it cleane off, and admit no exception. Besides, we haue shewed before that our aduersaries' Bibles, both Latine and French, translate the words as we do, *grauen Image, or representation*.

Our aduersaries themselves sufficiently shew, that this commandement displeaseth them, seeing they haue taken it out of their Ladies Houres and Seruice bookes, which they suffer the poore people to reade. Behold word for word how the first table of the Law is set downe in our Ladies Houres after the manner of Rome, and which at this day are most vsed.

1. Commandement.

I am the Lord thy God; thou shalt not haue, nor worship any other God but me.

2. Commandement.

Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vaine.

3. Commandement.

Remember to keepe holy the Sabbath day, and feasts.

With the like corruption they haue put the commandements of God into verse, where the prohibition to make any grauen Image is cleane omitted. So the Councell of Ausbourg

* The Latine hath *sculptile*, in the 20. of Exod.

The French hath representation in the 5. of Deut.

* Printed at Paris by Honneur Blannin in S. Victors streete at the signe of the three Moones, 1611.

bourg which is in the last Tome of Councils, holden anno 1548. puts the Commandements of God in high Douch as they are to be propounded to the people, wherein there is no speech of Images, nor of the resemblance of things which are in heauen or in earth.

Herein our aduersaries do as he doth that out of ten bags of mony stealeth one, and then puts one of the nine that are left into two bags, to the end that his theft may not be perceiued. For hauing taken one out of the ten Commandements of the Law, they cut the last into two, making the not coueting of a mans wife the ninth Commandement, and the not coueting of the house, the manservant and the maidervant, &c. the tenth. By this meanes they might make 14. Commandements, if on every thing whereof God forbiddeth the coueting they would make a Commandement apart. But God, by his prouidence hath taken all excuse from our aduersaries: for in the 20. of Exodus the not coueting of our neighbours wife, which they make the ninth commandement, is thrust into the middle of the tenth, and put after the not coueting of our neighbours house, whereby it followeth, that according to the Church of Rome, in the 20. of Exodus there is no ninth Commandement.

Whereupon we should giue them good matter to make fowle exclamations against vs, if we should follow them. For what would they say of vs, or rather what would they not say, if we had bene so bold as to cut off or to suppress one onely syllable of that most sacred Law which God pronounced by his owne mouth, and wrote with his finger in Tables of stone? which he published from the midst of the fire and the smoke with an extraordinary maiestie? Shall wormes of the earth be so audacious to correct the Law of God, or to find any thing superfluous therein? Will men be so bold to enterprise to cut off and to change the soueraigne Law by the which they must be iudged to the last day? to the end that they may be culpable, to haue not onely transgressed the Law by disobedience, but also to haue pared it through contempt, yea & to haue made it shorter by a Commandement, where-

One onely
God thou
shalt adore, &
loue him per-
fectly. Thou
shalt not
sweare by
Gods Name:
in vaine.

in God speaketh with great modestie, calling himselfe strong and ielous, and thereunto adding his threatnings and his promises.

Of adoration of Images, and of the seruice and worship which is yeelded and giuen vnto them.

120. Ques.

The holy Scripture speaketh of two adorationes, one ciuill, the other religious. Ciuill adoration is that which is giuen to Princes and Superiours, yea although they be wicked. So Genesis 23. *Abraham* bowed himselfe before the Heithites; and Genesis 32. *Isaac* bowed himselfe before his brother *Esaue*. In which places the Hebrew word is the same which we translate to *worship*; when we speake of the worship of God.

Religious adoration is an action of religion, whereby a reasonable creature humbleth himselfe before one, calling vpon him; and seruing him with seruice belonging to religion, appearing before him as before one that knoweth his heart and his thought; and that can heare his prayers. When we dispeere of the adoration of Images, we vnderstand religious adoration: for this adoration is done in the Church, and by order from the Pastors; and is an act of religion, by the which in worshipping the Images of Saints men thinke they do seruice to God.

In this point the Church of Rome hath vmeasurably gone astray, and hath directly striven against God. The second Countsell of Nice, which the Church of Rome placeth among the generall Councils, whereof Pope *Adrian* the first was the procurer, about twenty times ordaineth that Images should be adored; what finally for Conclusion setteth downe this determination, which is found in the seventh Act: *We hold that we must adore and salute the Image of the virgin Marie the undefiled mother of God, and of the glorious*

glorious Angels, and of all the Saints. And that if any one be of a contrarie opinion, and doubteth or wavereth touching the adoration of venerable Images, our holy and venerable Synode holdeth him to be accursed. In the same Councell there is an Epistle written by Pope Adrian to Theophrastus Patriarch of Constantinople, where the sayd Pope saith thus; Let your Holinesse perswade to serue and adore the Images of all the Saints. There also Images are advanced to such degree of excellencie and holinesse, that in the fourth Action it is said, That Images are of like and equal value with the holy Gospell. And, *Ad maiorem imaginis quam oratio.* And to the end that men might paint Angels; it is said in the fifth Action, The Church holdeth, that Angels are corporeall and not inuisible, hauing a body either of aire or of fire.

Now to the end that by adoring we should not onely vnderstand to reuerence, honour or respect, but also to yeeld and to giue them religious worship, the Patriarch Theophrastus, which was President at that Councell, pronounced this sentence in the 6. Action: All those which confesse that they reuerence Images, and neuertheless refuse to adore them, are reprov'd by the holy father Anastasius to be hypocrites: for when they refuse that adoration, which is a signe or marke of honour, it is manifest that they do the contrary, that is, that they speake iniuriously of the Saints.

Following this doctrine, our Aduersaries haue written diuers bookes *De cultu Imaginum*: Of the worship of Images, Cardinall Bellarmine, in the 23 chapter of his booke of Images, will haue them to be adored, not onely in regard of that which they represent, but also in themselves, laying, The ordinarie adoration which we giue to externall Images, is in themselves and properly. And in the 24. chapter he setteth downe this maxime in great letters, saying, that the Images of Christ and of Saints ought to be worshipped; not onely by accidents and improperly, but in themselves and properly: in such manner, that the worshipping is limited to the Image considered in it selfe, and not onely in this, that it representeth the person

a Imagines
omnium San-
ctorum beati-
tate vestra co-
le et adora-
re pergas.

b Vt etiam
in iudicio
cum sanctis
Euangelis et
reuerenda
cruce aquina-
leant.

c Ecclesia
sentit non om-
nino esse cor-
poris expertas
et inuisibiles;
verum cunctis
corpora pro-
ditos aeris
sua ignis

d Imagines
Christi et
Sanctorum
reuerenda
sunt, non so-
lum per acci-
dens, vel im-
propiè, ita vt
ipsa terminent
venerationem
vt in se consi-
derantur, et
non solum ve-
ricem gerant
exemplaris.

a Editioni
Paris. p. 1610.
Nec absurdū
putauerit B.
Patrum infi-
uisse cultum
aliquem sum-
morum (nā-
pe sacrarum
Imaginum)
asse, cum fide-
les nominati
ab illiciti-
dolorum cal-
oribus depu-
rare voluit.
f. Non solum
Imago depi-
cta, & res sa-
cra auctor in-
state publica in
cultum Dei
exposita, sed
quancunque
alia res mun-
di sine inani-
ma, & irrati-
onalis, sine ra-
tionalis na-
tura rei, & se-
cluso periculo,
viti, cū Deo fi-
ent Imago eius
adorari potest.
Ibi. 5. 8. p. 455.
Quid quod
obscure potest
quo minus
quancunque
rem mundi
cum Deo qui
in ea est secun-

person for whom it is made.

Grigoris de Valentia the Iesuite, in the second booke of Idolatrie, chap. 7. hath these words; *It is not absurd to thinke, that Saint Peter would say, that some religious seruice of Images (which are sacred Images) is good, when he would expressly withdraw this faithfull from the unlawfull worship of Idols.* The reason is, seeing that Saint Peter forbiddeth the vnlawfull worship of Idols, it is a signe that there is a lawfull worship.

But this is worse, and such as would make a mans haire to stand vpright vpon his head to heare it. *Vasquez* the Iesuite, *De adoratione. lib. 3. disp. 1. cap. 2. p. 458.* printed in Moguntia, anno 1601. in 8.^o maintaineth, that all things, euen vnreasonable creatures and without life, may be adored with God, as being his Image. In such manner, that according to this Doctors opinion, men may worship a Frog or a Mouſe, considering them to be the Images of God; and in as much as God is present in them. Nay, he proceedeth further, to maintaine that it is lawfull for Christians to worship a straw, saying, *The Wicklessians on vaine object against Christians which worship Images, that they may as well adore a straw, because in it there appeared some signe or token of the Trinitie.* For *Leonius* would as willingly haue confessed the same touching a straw, which he confesseth of all other things; so farre off is it to be thought to be absurd.

Then seeing that the Doctors themselves are so blinded, it is no maruell that the common people are so furiously superstitious about the seruice and worship of Images. For as they fall downe before them, they light Candles vnto them, they put costly apparell vpon them, and bring them offerings. In the beginning of Lent the people go on procession to the Image of our Lady, to haue leaue to eate butter. Poore old women rub their kerchers vpon the feet of an Image, and then kisse them. The Catechisme of the Councell of Trent

thinkes

thinks it good, that before the Image of an he or a she Saint, men should say, *Our Father which art in heauen.* It is an ordinarie thing to speake to a peece of wood, or to a painted Image, as if it vnderstood them. There are particular prayers which are made to the Image of the face of Iesus Christ, printed in a peece of linnen cloth, wherewith the words are directly spoken to the painted cloth and to the Image, and are not agreeable to Iesus Christ. The prayer saith: *I salute thee, Oh holy face of the Redeemer, printed in a white cloth, given to Veronique in signe of love. Cleanse vs from vices, and ioine vs in societie with the blessed. Oh blessed Image, and happy figure, cause vs to see the face of Iesus Christ.* With the like abuse when they lift vp the Image of the Crosse, they say: *Aue lignum triumphale, All haile triumphant wood. Add. And tuus spes unica, All haile O crosse our onely hope; increase righteousness in the faithfull, and pardon sinners.* This superstition beganne already to enter into the mindes of some particular persons in Saint Augustines time, of whom he speaketh thus; *Lib. i. cap.*

34. of the Customes of the catholicke Church saying, *I know that there are manie worshippers of Sepulchers and Pictures: I know many which drinke excessively for the dead.*

Against this so prodigious an abuse, and so lamentable blindness, we haue the commandement of the Law of God which our Aduersaries haue put out of their Ladies houres and Seruices; *Thou shalt not make to thy selfe any graven image, nor the likeness of any thing which is in heauen above, nor in the earth below, nor in the waters vnder the earth, thou shalt not bow downe to them nor worship them.* This word pronounced with thunder and lightening, as yet thundreth against idolatrie, and lighteneth darkness. So Iesus Christ said to the diuell, *Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him onely shalt thou serue.* Reade *Leuit. 26. 1.*

Against this so cleare and manifest word of God, accompanied with terrible threatninges, our aduersaries shroud themselves with weake reasons, as if a man should hide himselfe in the water against raine.

They

*Salus sancta
facies nostri
redemptoris.
In qua nides
species diuini
splendoris. Im-
pressa panni-
culo nunci can-
dore.*

*Salus vultus
Domini ima-
go beata. Nos
deduc ad pro-
pria O salus
figura! ad vi-
dendam faciem
qua est Christi
para.*

*Noni multos
esse sepulcro-
rum & pictu-
rarum adora-
tores. Noni
multos qui
super mortuos
luculentissimè
bibant.*



1 They contest about the words *Idoll* and *Image*, but the Bible of their owne translation saith, *graven Image and representation*. And the general prohibition not to make any resemblance of things which are in heaven or in earth which is added therunto, stops all evasions whatsoever.

2 They say that they reserve all diuine worship called *Latria* vnto God, and yeeld an inferiour religious worship called *Dulia*, to Saints and their Images: but the word of God speaketh but of one religious seruice, and that is to be performed to God onely. When the prohibition to adore Images is general in the Law, it belongs not to man to make any restraints or exceptions against it; drawne out of their owne braines. Such distinctions are to be receiued when they are contained in the word of God. It belongs to the law-maker, and not to subjects, to make exceptions vpon the law. Now our aduersaries neither bring places out of the Scripture, commandement of God, nor any examples, which in any sort do approve or establish religious adoration of creatures. But on the contrarie, in the Scripture this religious seruice which our aduersaries call *Dulia*, is expressly reserved to God onely, with an expresse prohibition to attribute it to any other but to God. So in Sam. 1. 7. The Greeke hath *iniquam esse uiam*. *Nec quæ uultis adorare, id adoremus deum: id est, Directe or prepare your hearts to the Lord, and giue *Dulia* to him onely.* And Paul, Galath. 4. 8. *etiam nunc idola seruatis, id est, idola seruatis, id est, idola seruatis, id est, idola seruatis.* Then when you know not God you giue *Dulia*, that is, you serued those who by nature were no Gods. And whosoever vnderstandeth Greeke, knoweth that *Latria* is lesse then *Dulia*; for *Latria* simply signifieth seruice of honour, reuerence, and subiection; but *Dulia*, besides that, importeth a slavish seruitude. Saint *Augustine* in his 20. booke, cap. 21. against *Faustus* a Manichee, & in his Questions vpon Genesis, lib. 1. cap. 61. vseth this distinction, but in contrary sence to our aduersaries. For he saith, that *Dulia* is giuen to men that are aliue, and consequently by the word *Dulia* he vnderstandeth no religious seruice. And in fine, who seeth not the puerilitie of this proceeding? For after they haue suppressed the

the second Commandment of the Law, if any one make it knowne to the people, they set before them a forked distinction of words in bad Greeke; which the people vnderstand not, and which those that are wise know to be mistaken; raising vp a cloud of dust with their Latia, Dulia, and Hyperdulia, to escape through this thicke mist.

3. If these two sorts of religious adoration were receiued, the proofes which the Scripture vseth to proue the diuinity of Christ, would be weake and of no force. As when the Apostle Hebr. i. 6. proueth Christs diuinitie by that which is written of him, *That all the Angels of God worship him*; the enemies of his diuinitie would say, that there an anserior adoration is spoken of; which may be attributed to a creature.

4. They say, that the honour which men do to Images, turneth to the honour of that which they represent; which is the speech of all idolaters. So *Micheas* mother, Iudges 17. 3. determining to make a molten Image in the house of God, said, *I had wholy dedicated the silver vnto the Lord from my hand; for my sonne to make a graven Image*. And thereupon *Michea* perswaded himselfe that God would blesse him. It appeareth by the 5. and 6. verses of the 18. Chapter, that the prayers made before that Image were directed vnto God. The same excuse a Pagan made kneeling on his knees before an Image; as *St. Augustine* saith vpon the 114. Psalme, saying; *I worship not the Image, but thereby I represent vnto my selfe the resemblance of that which I should adore.*

5. If we consider what honours men yeeld and giue vnto Images of Saints, we shall finde that the honour is properly done to the Image, and that the Saint is neuer the more honored; and that *Bellarmin* hath reason to say, that the Image is worshipped for it selfe. For when they clothe an Image, the Saint is not adorned thereby; if they offer to an Image, the Saint hath no part thereof; if they set vp candles lighted before an Image, the Saint is not lighted therewith; if any man speakes to an Image, the Saint esteemeth himselfe to be no more honored then if a King should thinke himselfe to be honoured when a man speaketh to his picture before his face.

6. The abuse is evident, in that our adversaries to witwine themselves, with intricate words of dark words, giving us an adoration of Latras, Dulia, and Hyperdulia, and each of these either absolute or relative; in such manner that there are five sorts of religious adoration which the people neither understand nor practise, who falling down before an Image, come thither with all their devotion; and divide not their intents into so many parts. Whosoever shall enter into the examination of these adorations, shall finde that in them there is not onely deceit and intricatenesse, but also manifest foolishnesse; for the last refuge of our adversaries is to say, that the adoration of Images is a relative adoration, and which hath regard to the things represented by the Image; But this is nothing, for to adore an Image relatively is still to adore the Image; & to adore an Image having regard to the Saint which is represented therein is no adoration of the Saint. And seeing that the adoration of the Image is relative, but the adoration of the Saint is absolute and absolute, it followeth, that the adoration of the Saint and the adoration of his Image are two sorts of adoration. And which is double; If his relative adoration be secured, there is no creature in the world but it may be adored. Some will adore and worship the Sun, and the Moone, and beasts, and trees, and say that such adoration is relative to God; and that they adore them because of him, that created them, and in respect of him.

7. Adde hereunto, that all these distinctions serve onely to shew what the intent of the Church of Rome is; but not to ground this intention upon the word of God; nor to shew that God or the Saints approve this relative adoration. For if it were lawfull to worship and adore Saints; yet before we should adore their Image with relative adoration, it were good to be assured that the Saints will be honoured in that sort. Seeing it is not likely that a King would thinke himself so to be honoured by him that should do reverence to his picture, or that should speak to his cloke, although he should say, that the honour he doth is relative; and the reverence respectue.

8 They adde, that the abuse offered to an Image redoundeth to him that is represented by that Image; whence, say they, it followeth, by a reason drawne from contraries, that the honour which is done to an Image, is an honour to him that is represented thereby. I answer, it is false that the disgrace done to an Image doth alwayes disgrace him that is represented thereby: for oftentimes he which is represented, hateth that representation. So the King ordaineth that his Image stamped vpon false money shall be cut in peeces, and molten. The Israelites worshipped the brazen Serpent in honour of God, and yet *Ezechias* did well to breake downe that Serpent; for it is not credible that those which worshipped that brazen Serpent, did beleue that a peece of brasse was the soueraigne God: but they referred an inferiour adoration vnto it, in remembrance of the vertue which God had shewed thereby.

9 They mend the matter much, by saying that they worship not the Images of false gods, as the Pagans did, but the Images of the friends and seruants of God. For we must not transport that religious seruice which is due to God onely, to his friends nor to his enemies. If it be euill to honour euill things, it is euill to abuse good things, and to vse Gods friends to prouoke him to ieaiousie. Idolatrie in the Scripture is called adultery. A woman is not excusable, although she giueth her bodie adulterously to none but to her husbands friends. This excuse then shall be allowed, when they haue proued that God will haue the Images of his seruants to be adored.

10 They also alledge a companie of false miracles done by Images. But if they were true, doth it follow that we must adore all that whereby God hath done miracles? Then we must adore the Asses iaw which *Samson* vsed, *Moses* rod, and the water of Iordan which healed *Naaman*, and many such like things.

11 Wanting reasons, they haue recourse to the Scripture, hoping that that will serue them without reason. The second Councell of Nice, and Pope *Adrian* which expressly made a declaration for the defence of that Councel, with a ridiculous

Act. 6.

Act. 4.

Act. 6.

subtiltie collected an heape of places out of the Scripture for the adoration of Images: as in the second of Cant. it is said, *Show me thy face, and let me heare thy voice.* In the second of Genes. it is said, *God made man after his owne Image.* And Exod. 18. *Moses bowed downe to Iethro his father in law.* And Rom. 15. *Paul saith, That all things which are written, are written for our instruction.* And Psalme 47. *As we have heard, so we haue seene.* And Luke 18. *No man after he hath lighted a candle, setteth it under a bushell.* Vpon these places these reuerend Fathers ground the adoration of Images. They forgot *Goliath* combat with *David*, and *Sampsons* foxes, for those may be alledged to as good purpose for the adoration of Images. Whosoever doth not acknowledge the absurditie of these proofes, is blinder then Images themselves.

Imagines Cherubim super arca existimantes necessariis adorabantur ab iis qui arcam adorabant.

12. New commers vse other weapons. *Bellarmino* in the 12. Chap. of his booke of Images, saith that the Iewes worshipped the Cherubins placed vpon the Arke. First I say, if that be true, it must needs be that God commanded it, but that is no where to be found. Secondly, if the Israelites adored the Cherubins, they would much more haue adored the Angels figured, as they say, by those Cherubins; which before we haue shewed to be false. Thirdly, if the Israelites adored the two Cherubins placed vpon the Arke, then the Cherubins must needs haue bene the Images of some certaine Angels, otherwise they should haue adored they knew not what. In the Church of Rome it selfe they worship not an Image whose name they know not, and what Saint it representeth: but those Cherubins had no names, nor were the figures of any particular Angels. Then to worship them had bene a seruice done to an vnknowne Cherubine, as in Athens they worshipped the vnknowne God. Fourthly, adde hereunto, that if the Israelites adored those Images, then it must needs be that they saw them. But the Cherubins were shur vp in the Sanctuary, and the people saw them not, no more then those that were painted in the curtaines in the holy place. And for the space of 500. yeares and more after *Salomons* time, the people saw them not. God by taking them away from the peoples sight,

fight preuented idolatrie. Fifthly and lastly, put the case that the people did adore the Arke, (which neuerthelesse is false) yet thereby it followeth not, that they adored the Cherubins placed vpon the Arke. He that salueth the king, doth he salute his hat, or his clothes? There is neither reason nor appareance thereof.

13. In the end, failing of better proofes, they produce two notable falsifications of the Scripture. They say, that in the Psalme 98. verse 5. it is said, *Worship the stoole vnder his feete.* From whence they draw this ridiculous consequence, that we must adore Images. But according to the Hebrew it is, *Worship towards the stoole vnder his feete.* So the holy place is called, towards the which the people turned their faces when they worshipped. In the same manner & termes as it is said in the last v. of the same Psal. *Worship toward the mountaine of his holinesse.* The Chaldean Paraphrase expounds it so, & *Nicolas de Lira*, *Paginnus*, and *Arias Montanus* do the like. It is true, that to adore God, or to fall downe before God, are all one thing. And when we speake of ciuill adoration, to worship the king, or to kneele before the king, is all one. But when we speake of things insensible, to kneele downe before an Altar, or before a mountaine, is not to adore the altar or the mountaine: specially in matter of religious adoration, which God hath reserued to himselfe onely, and which is directed by his commandement.

14. With the like falsenesse and to the same end, they alledge Hebrewes, 11. 27. where it is said according to the Romane translation, that *Iacob dying, blessed both the sonnes of Joseph, and worshipped the end of his staffe.* But in the Greeke it is, *προσκύνησεν εἰς τὸ ἀκρὸς τοῦ ῥαβδίου αὐτοῦ*, he worshipped vpon the end of his staffe. The second Councell of Nice in the second Aet translateth faithfully, saying, *Iacob in summitate virga adorauit*, and not *summitatem*. The Iesuites *Ribera* and *Emanuel Sa*, translate this place as we do. The thing is as cleare as day, and the falsification of the place most euidēt.

Adorauit summitatem virga eius.

*Of Adoration or worshipping of the Crosse. And of the
signe of the Crosse made in the aire.*

221. Sect.

The Crosse of Christ is the glory of the faithfull, the support of their hope, and their principall consolation. This Crosse is a terror to the diuels, the victory of hell, the death of death eternall. It is the body of the shadowes of the Law, the truth of figures, the substance of Prophecies, the foundation of the Covenant made with God, the effect of the Gospell. For in it consisteth our learning to know Iesus Christ and him crucified. This Crosse is more worth then kings Crowns; the sufferings of the Sonne of God surpasse the triumphs of mightie Monarkes, his death is more worth then the life of all men.

But by the Crosse of Christ I do not vnderstand a peece of wood, but the sufferings and passion of our Sauour. Colos. 1. 18. 19. it is said, *For it pleased the Father by him to reconcile all things to himselfe, through peace made by that blond of the Crosse.* God hath washed our soules in his bloud, and buried our sins in his death. There is nothing sweeter to our consciences then the remembrance of his bitterness, nothing more honorable then this reproch.

Ancient Christians in *Tertullians* time, that is, 200. yeares after the birth of our Lord, marked their foreheads with the signe of the Crosse, to witnesse that they were not ashamed of the Crosse of Christ. Not long after they proceeded to paint the figure of the Crosse. The *Labarum* or standart borne in the wars before the Emperors of Rome, namely before *Constantine*, was made like a Crosse. But *Constantine* added thereunto the name of Christ, which made some say, that *Constantine* fixed the signe of the Crosse in his standart. Kings made that signe to be stamped vpon their moneys, and eleuated it in the flags of the ships of Christians. Vntill that time there was nothing to be disliked therein.

But when deuotion began to degenerate and turne to superstition, euerie age adding some new thing, after that men

men had once learned to make wisdom e or comelineſſe a rule, in ſtead of ſubiecting themſelves to the rule of the word of God, this ſigne of the Croſſe made both in the aire; and painted, did inſenſibly change his nature. Men began to make the ſigne of the Croſſe in the aire by forme of conjuration to drive away diuels; and to make a precise multitude of Croſſes vpon the hoſt, and vpon the chalice by order; and if a Priest failed in that number, the myſterie was ſpoyled. Pope Innocent the third in his booke of the Myſteries of the Maſſe, cap. 58. ſaith, *a That the Priests make ſignes of the Croſſe vpon the hoſt to withſtand the force of diuels, leſt they ſhould preuaile againſt the Priest, or againſt the hoſt, which is Ieſus Chriſt (if we will beleuee it.)* This aide came in good time to Ieſus Chriſt. This is no ſmal benefit that a Priest doth to his God, to defend him with ſignes of the Croſſe made in the aire againſt the force of the diuell.

With an abuſe yet much worſe, they adore little peeces of wood, which they ſay are peeces of the wood of the true Croſſe, with diuine worſhip called Latria, that is, with the ſoueraigne adoration that belongeth to God onely; ^b as almoſt all the Doctours of the Romiſh Church teach. And they adore the Image of the Croſſe with religious worſhip, as Cardinall Bellarmine in the 30. Chapter of his booke of Images ſaith, *c We worſhip all Croſſes, becauſe all of them are images of the true Croſſe, yea and ſimple Croſſes without the crucifixe. We adore (ſaith he) the Croſſe it ſelfe without the crucifixe thereon.* Therefore alſo they offer incenſe vnto it, as we ſee in the Pontificall. And when they liſt vp the Croſſe, they ſay, *Ecce crux, adoremus.* Likewiſe they ſpeake to the wood of the Croſſe, ſaying, *Aue lignum triumphale, All haile triumphant wood: and O aue crux ſpes unica, auge ppi inſtitiom, reſiſſe dona veniam:* I ſalute thee oh Croſſe, our onely hope, increaſe righteouſneſſe in the faithfull, and pardon ſinners. You muſt note that they do not worſhip the Image of the Croſſe but after it hath bene conſecrated, and that he which did conſecrate it, preſently thereupon doth worſhip it, as the Pontificall teacheth, in the Chapter of the Bleſſing of a new Croſſe; ^d and

a Efficis ſuper ea crucis ſignaculum, ut per crucis virtutem omnes conatus diabolice malignitatis effugias, ne contraſacerdotem vel ſacrificium aliquo modo praualeant.
^b Thomas 3. parte. Quæſt. 5. Artic. 3. & 4. & Caietanum in Thomam. Ibid. Alexander 3. parte. Quæſt. 30. art. ultimo.
 Bonauentura, Marcellus, Almarino Carthusianus, Capreolus in 3. diſt. 9. Henricus quodlibetico 10. 4. 6. Nancianus in Epiſt. ad Rom. c. 1.
^c Omnes crucis adoremus quia omnes ſunt imagines vera crucis.

* Hoc signum
crucis tua sit
remedium sa-
lutis generi
humani, sit
soliditas fidei,
perfectio bo-
norū operum,
redemptio ani-
marum, sala-
rium & pro-
fectio ac tute-
la contra san-
dacula inimi-
corum.

and that when the Crosse is blest, they beseech God that that signe of the Crosse may be a sauing remedie, the redemption of soules, and a defence against the cruell arrowes of aduersaries.

But we, who by so many afflictions and persecutions haue learned to beare the Crosse of Christ, and to glorie in his reproch, and which with the Apostle, Galat. 6. 14. say, *God forbid that I should reioyce, but in the Crosse of our Lord Iesui Christ, whereby the world is crucified vnto me, and I vnto the world;* because of the abuse, haue left off making the signe of the Crosse and painting it in our Churches, knowing how therein deceit is easie, and superstition credulous, and the effects dangerous, so farre as to worship a peece of wood with that worship which is due vnto God onely.

1 To begin then with adoration of peeces of the Crosse, *Paul Rom. 14. 13.* saith, that *whatsoever is not of faith is sinne:* and speaketh this concerning the vse of meates, in which that a man sinne not, he will haue him to vse them in faith, that is to say, with assurance that God liketh that which he doth therein, and that it is not contrarie to his word: by greater reason we must haue this assurance in matters of adoration, and when question is made touching the yeelding of religious seruice to the creature. Now it is impossible that he that worshippeth a peece of wood, should do it with y assurance. For first, how shal he be assured that that chip of wood is a peece of the true Crosse? seeing that if the wood of the Crosse which at this day is kept in relickes, were all put together in a heape, it would be wood enough to load fiftie carts? specially seeing there was a publicke trafficke made of that wood in our fathers times, and that the same wood is distributed abroad like marchandise? In the yeare of our Lord 1239. *Iohn de Brennes* calling himselfe king of Ierusalem, hauing neede of money, sold the Crowne of thornes to *Lewis* the ninth king of France, a meeke, vpright, and religious Prince according to the time, but easie to be circumuented: and the true Crosse to the Venetians, who sold the same againe for twice the value that they paid for it, to the said king *Lewis*: who for those relickes

relicks onely caused the holy Chappell in the pallace of Paris to be built to keepe them in.

2 Secondly, it is impossible to worship peeces of wood with assurance that God liketh of that adoration, seeing that God hath not commanded it, and that there is not one word spoken thereof in the Scripture: seeing also that God hath forbidden to worship and serue any other but himselfe, as we haue proued in the precedent Section, and that the Prophets euery where condemne those that worship wood or stone.

3 Adde hereunto, that if a peece of wood which men by coniecture suppose to be a peece of the true Crosse, ought to be adored with religious worship, much more the whole Crosse. And if at this day a peece of rotten worme-eaten wood ought to be worshipped, by greater reason the whole Crosse ought to haue bene adored when it stood vpright, and was yet bloudie and hote with the bloud of Iesus Christ: and yet the Apostles did not then adore it, nor commanded the faithfull to adore it. It had bene an easie matter for euery one of them to haue cut a peece thereof to beare about them, to serue them for a preseruatiue against euill aire, against thunder, and against the diuels; but they neuer thought vpon it. And not onely they, but also the Christians after them for the space of three hundred yeares, left that Crosse without once troubling themselues to seeke for it. Certainly our aduersaries by their scrupulous diligence accuse the Apostles of carelesnesse and negligence.

Bellarmino in his Booke of Images, cap. 20. and 21. perceiuing that in it there is an abuse, opposeth himselfe against that multitude of Doctors who will haue the Crosse to be worshipped with diuine worship called *Latria*, which is due to God, and will haue the Crosse to be worshipped with an inferior worship, by that meanes making the worshipping of the Crosse to be another worship then that wherewith men worship the Crucifixe, which ought to haue soueraigne worship. And hereby he troubleth the imagination of the people, who worshipping the Crosse, thinke they do but one worship: but *Bellarmino* will haue them to do two at one time, and

and to cut their deuotion in two peeces. But howsoever he pretend to adore the Crosse with inferiour religious seruice, yet still he yeeldeth religious seruice to the creature, and so incurreth that punishment set downe in the Law of God, against those that serue the creature in stead of seruing God onely.

It is to no purpose for them to say, that the wood of the true Crosse is to be worshipped because it touched the body of Iesus Christ. If that be so, that part of the Crosse which touched the body of our Lord, ought to be more worshipped then that part which touched it not. And by that reason we must worship the ground whereon Christ went, and the river wherein he was baptized, and their hands that strooke him, and *Indas* mouth that kissed him. And we must thereupon haue some commandement of God, to worship those things which touched the bodie of our Lord.

Certainly if the body of our Lord by being touched did sanctifie insensible things, in such manner as to make them worthe of worship, much more would he haue sanctified those, who bearing great loue vnto him had touched him. Why then would he deprive *Mario Magdalen* of that grace, saying vnto her, *Touch me not, for I am not yet ascended to my Father?* The Church of Rome doth not worship emptie Chalice, although they beleue that the blood of Christ hath bin therein. It doth not worship the Priest when it beleueth that he hath Iesus Christ in his stomacke. And certainly after the death of a Priest, it is a wonder that his stomacke which was wont to be the ordinarie receptracle of Iesus Christ, is not layed vp among Relickes, and consecrated for that touching.

Touching the adoration of the Image of the Crosse, we haue alreadie condemned it to be idolatrie, by all that which we formerly produced against adoration of Images. And if it be idolatrie to worship the Image of a living thing, much more to worship the Image of a senselesse thing. And I would gladly know to whom they speake, when in the Romish Church they say, *I salute thee wood*. Do they speake to Iesus Christ?

Christ? Iesus Christ is not wood. Do they speake to the wood? That wood vnderstandeth them not. Do they speake to that wood in honour of Iesus Christ? That whereunto men speake in honour of Iesus Christ, ought to vnderstand what a man saith: No man (if he be not mad) doth speake to the wood of the kings chaire in honor of the king. But on the contrary, he were worthy to be bound with *Hypocrates* bands, that speaketh to a painted chaire; and doth reuerence thereunto. That is it which is dobe in the Romish Church: where they not onely speake to the Crosse, but also to the Image of the Crosse, adoring it.

To be short, we must alwayes haue recourse to the commandement of God, and to the prohibition to make any Image; for the likeness of things which are in heauen or in earth, nor to fall downe before them, nor to do any worship vnto them.

Touching this custome of carrying a peece of the wood of the true Crosse about men, note by the way, that the nature of false religions is to change vertues into outward shewes, and necessarie piety into superfluous ceremonies. Also to obey the commandement of our Saviour, who will haue vs to beare his Crosse, in the Church of Rome they beare a peece of wood hanging about their necks. They carrie the Crosse hanging downe vpon their bellies: but that belly is an enemy to the Crosse of Iesus Christ. But touching the true Crosse wherof Iesus Christ speaketh, which is affliction for the Gospel, the Church of Rome makes vs beare that, persecuting those which say the Crosse of Christ is our onely satisfaction, our onely merit, and our onely propitiatory sacrifice.

Our difference is not, whether we must with honour keepe the relikes of Saints, or whether their sepulchers ought to be set in decent places, and their memories honourable. That

is
Of Reliques, and of their worship.

Our difference is not, whether we must with honour keepe the relikes of Saints, or whether their sepulchers ought to be set in decent places, and their memories honourable. That

121. Sect.

is not questionable: for if with a commendable curiositie we visite the Sepulchers of ancient Pagan Emperors, and persons of great fame, either for military vertues, or knowledge in good learning, and doing so we are not blamed; how much more willingly would we see the tombes of the Apostles, and of those organs of the holy Ghost which yet speake now after they are dead? And if their sepulchers were in an vndeceitfull place, or exposed to the contempt and disgrace of infidels, it were a godly dutie and a good worke, to transport them into some more convenient and sure place. If *Agilantius* said, that the bones of Saints ought to be cast ypon dunghills; & if *Hierome* did truly and without passion report the opinion of that person, there is not one of vs but would abhorre those profane words. It is true, that our aduersaries object against vs, that during the troubles and civil warres, we burnt the Saints reliques, and melted the shrines wherein their bodies lay: But if those reliques had bene true reliques, and worthy of reverence, yet they do wrong to impute that to the religion which was done by the insolencie of certaine souldiers, whereof a great part were of the Romish Church; and serving those which first hired them, had authoritie among ours to haue part of the booty. They ought also to remember, that those things were done by the souldiers without warrant from the Church, to reuenge those massacres and burnings which were done vpon and against vs many yeares before we thought vpon our owne defence. It is a small manner to spoyle Churches, in respect of burning and massacring of the faithfull, which are the temple of God. And it is an hard and a difficult thing, when men are once entred into armes, to reaine and hold them that are prouoked to anger within the bounds of mediocritie. But the chiefe point is, that all those reliques which were in that manner disperfed, were of the same nature with those which are yet left, that is, false reliques of true Saints, or true reliques of false Saints, that liued not long since, and were beholding to the Pope for the title of Saints. Which if those that worshipped them had buried in perpetuall oblivion, they had thereby healed Christendome of a great wound,

wound, and had abolished strange superstition. Adde herunto, that by the dissipation of reliques objected vnto vs, the number of reliques is rather increased then diminished. For soone after they forged others in greater number, which being newer and lesse vsed, ought to be of greater value, and haue more vertue.

Who is able to declare the enormitie of this abuse? In the Church of Rome they adore bones, old clothes, milke, and haire: they speake vnto those reliques, they kisse them, they perfume them with incense, they offer vnto them, and they carrie them about in procession. When they shew them vnto the people, alwayes the basin is hard by, whereinto euerie one throwes a peece of money. The second Councell of Nice holden anno 787. in the 4. Action, will haue *their bones, albes, and old clothes worshipped.* Bellarmine in the fourth Chapter of the booke of Relicks groundeth the worshipping of them vpon these words of *Chrysostome*, in his Sermon vpon *Inuentius*, and *Maximus*: *Tumulos martyrum adoramus*: Let vs adore *Martyrs* tombes: putting *adoramus* for *adornemus*, by an euident fallshood. Cardinall *Baronius* in his 9. tome, an. 821. saith, that Pope *Clement* the 8. sent him to view and to worship the venerable bodie of *Cecile*. Without the quire of *Saint Pauls* Church in Paris on the left side, the miracles of *Saint Roe* are painted, with this inscription, *That men are brailed of a bile or a plague-sore by adoring his precious bodie.* The Catechisme of the Councell of Trent, in the exposition of the third Commandement, approveth the custome to sweare by the reliques of Saints. Now to sweare by any thing, is to take it for a witnesse of the puritie of our conscience, and for a reuenge in case of periurie: which belongs onely vnto God, whose commandement in the sixth of Deuteronomie is thus, *Thou shalt feare the Lord thy God, and shalt serue him, and sweare by his name.* This was the forme and manner of an oath vsed in Israel, *The eternall liueth, and, As true as God liueth, &c, I call God to witnesse.* But they neuer sweare by the creature. It is a frivoulous excuse to say, that to sweare by reliques, is to sweare by God which hath sanctified them: for by the same reason we may.

Edis. Colon. p. 104. Offa, cineret, pannos, sanguinem, sepulchra denique martyrum adoramus.

§ 14. *Ne tam eo licet munus indignissimum promissum explorare & adorare venerandum Cecilia corpus.*

may sweare by the Sunne, and by heauen, and by the earth, and excuse our selues and say, that we vnderstand by them God which created those things. As also when they speake to those relikes, worshipping them, they say things vnto them which are not agreeable vnto God. When they say, *God preserve thee triumphant wood*, they speake not to God, which is not wood. Or if men speake to wood in honour of God, that thing whereunto one speaketh in honour of God, must alwayes vnderstand that which is spoken vnto it. The worship of relikes ought to be relative, so the greater part of our aduersaries say. Then to adore relikes, is not to adore God, for we must adore God with absolute adoration, and for the loue of himselfe. So the prayer which they make to the Iron point of the speare, is spoken in termes which are not agreeable with Iesus Christ; for after they haue said vnto it, *I salute thee triumphant Iron*, they say vnto it, *Wound vs with the point of him whom thou dost pierce.*

*In hymno, Aus
ferens triu-
phale, Felle
hastam a-
uore, per te
fuit saucia.*

To these relikes the people go with such seruent desire, that the seruice of God is key-cold in respect of that. All the Angels together haue not the fourth part of the honour which the people of Paris giue to the shrines of Saint *Genesius*, and Saint *Marsil*.

But if we looke nearer into these relikes, we cannot but admire their ingredients, and the diuersitie of trinkets and toys contained in them. The Cautels of the Masse ordaine that if Mice haue eaten the bodie of our Lord, those beasts shall be taken and burnt, and their ashes put into coffins or shrines for relikes. The same commendement is made touching the casting vp of the Sacrament by a Priest or a sicke person that shall haue cast his god out of his belly. At Beauvais in Beauvoisis, there is one of S. *Christophers* teeth, so great, that a dozen such teeth will fill the mouth of an ouen. At Rome, in Saint Iohn de Latrans Church, they keepe the fore-skin of Iesus Christ. In the Church which is in the Parke of wood at Vincennes, they haue some of the powder of Saint *Martin* cloake, and one of Iesus Christs sucking teeth. At Courtchiuerny neare to Bloys, they keepe *Iosephs* hemme at

the

the sound of his breathing when he hewed timber. Our pilgrimes from Galicia bring feathers of hennes that are of the race of that Cooke which crowed when Saint Peter denied Iesus Christ. Cardinall *Baronius*, in the nine hundred and two and twentieth yeare of his Annales, maketh mention of a Locke of the haire of Saint *Peters* beard which did miracles, *although* (saith he) *those that do sit in his Throne, seeke to overthrow it by euill manners.* And these reliques are kept so many ages and neuer corrupt. They say, that the virgine *Maries* Milke hath continued sixteene hundred yeares, and neuer was sowre.

Quantumlibet ipsi qui supra eius sedem sedent eam impugnet moribus praui.

In the meane time, we see the hosts which are called Iesus Christ, become mouldie in a few dayes, and the presence of Iesus Christ, which is life it selfe, cannot keepe the accidents of this ridiculous corruption from moulding; by the which they will haue the roundnesse, the breadth, the whitenesse, and the softnesse, to mould and breed wormes; that is to say, that from accidents they should turne into Substance. But not long since some reliques are become corrupt. For *Gregorie* of Tours, toward the end of his Historie saith, That hauing visited the reliques in S. *Martins* Church in Tours, he found them to be very rotten, but many yeares after they were all whole againe. The falshood of these reliques appeareth, not onely by the absurditie, but also in that they are contradicted by the truth of ancient Histories, as also by our aduersaries themselves.

At Chârtres they haue the virgine *Maries* smocke, which was brought from Constantinople into France by *Charles* the Bald, as they say that keepe it. And so saith *Faucher* (from their reports) in the eleuenth booke of the Antiquities of France, chap. 7. But *Charles* the Bald was neuer in Constantinople: and in the virgine *Maries* time they wore no smokes, which was the reason they vsed so many baths to wash the sweate from their bodies.

The Councell of Constance, in the tenth Session, saith that Saint *Iohns* head is in Saint *Siluesters* Monasterie of Nunnes in Rome. But *Amiens* and *Arras* brag that they haue it:

Edis. Colon. pag. 323.

and Saint John d'Angeri hath long time bene famous for the same reliques.

Whot shall decide the controuersie betweene Treues in Germanie, and Argentueil neare Paris; for both of them boast to haue the coate without seaine which our Sauour Christ wore? *Baronius* in his *Annales*, anno 1052 produceth a Bull of Pope *Leo* the ninth; whereby he declareth that those of Saint Denis by Paris mistake themselves, pretending that they haue the body of Saint *Denis Areopagita*; and saith, that the body of that Saint is whole in Ratisbone, to a very finger.

All men know, that in Saint Iohn Baptists time there were no altars in Iudea but those that were in the Temple of Ierusalem; yet the booke of Romish Indulgences printed at Rome, saith, that S. *Iohn de Lastran* was guardian of the altar whereon S. Iohn Baptist said Service in the wilderness.

Baronius in his Preface vpon his *Annales*, in 1. Tome, alledgeth a place of *Chrysostome* which saith, That the manger wherein Iesus Christ was borne, was of earth: which he confuteth, because that which is kept in Rome is made of wood.

Sigonius in the 7. booke of his Historie of Italie, saith, That at Genoa they keepe a Cup made of Emeralds, wherein our Lord Iesus Christ celebrated the holy Supper. But *Baronius* in anno 34. of his *Annales*, §. 63. (following *Beda*) saith, That it was a siluer cup with two handles or eares, and that the Sponge is in the Chalice.

At Collen men go to worship the three Kings; which neuer were. They call them *Gasper*, *Melchior*, and *Baltazar*: whereof the two first names are Dutch. This fable is conuicted to be false, by all the circumstances of time, place, and the historie of Saint *Matthew*, as also by all antiquitie.

Spaine boasteth, that at Compostella in Galicia they haue the body of S. *James* the Apostle brother of our Lord, which they say died there after he had conuerted *Lupa Qu.* of Spaine, and planted Christianity in Spaine. But Pope *Innocent* the first denieth that any other Apostle besides Saint *Peter* did teach the Gospell in France or in Spaine. And the truth

9. n. Christi
natalis nobis
lissimum mo-
numentum in
ligno consi-
ctum, nulla
que argenti
vel auri: Ca-
latura contu-
ctum post
multa tempo-
ra iude trans-
latum, Roma
possides.

Dist. 12. Can.
Quis nescias.
Locus filii
huius provincie
vilius Aposto-
lus immortali-
tatem legimus
desuisse, etc.

truth is, that then there was neither King nor Queene in Spaine, it being at that time wholly vnder the dominion of the Romane Empire. And Saint James death which happened not long after the death of Christ, Acts 12. gaue him not time nor leisure to make so long voyages. From this Saint James in Galicia Pilgrims bring Scallop shels, as from Saint Claude they bring Whistles; and from Rome holy graines. It is good vpon this subiect to heare what *Plas.* *verò apud aliquos* the Iesuite in his third booke of Adoration, saith: his words are these: *At touching this, that sometimes among reliques some are vncertaine, that hindereth vs not from worshipping those reuerently which we hold to be certaine by coniectures and humane reasons. To be short, euen as in the first Disputation, cap. 3. we haue said, that it is no sinne of Idolatrie to worship a beame of the light vnder the which the diuell hides himselfe when any one thinketh it to be Christ: so when any one thinketh that that is a part or member of a Saint which is not, yet neuertheless he loseth not the merite of his deuotion.* *aliquando reliquie sint, non obest quo minus eas quas humani coniecturis & rationibus certas habemus reuerenter colere debeamus.*

George Cassander in his Consultation, in the chapter of the worshipping of reliques, after he hath said, that in times past when the memorie of Martyrs was fresh and their reliques certaine, miracles were done at their sepulchers, but a buse hath crept in: That in the times of Basil, Ambrose, and Augustine, assemblies made in memorie of Martyrs were changed into faires, and into feasts, where the people dranke themselves drunke: That to inueigle the people, men haue supposed false reliques, and false miracles: and that oftentimes by diabollicall illusions, superstitious persons haue bene abused: That traouellers, for profite and gaine haue made marchandise of false reliques: That the custome to lay the bodies of Saints vnder the Altar is changed, and that now they lay them vpon the Altar. At last he addeth these words, saying; *At this day, when every place seemeth to be full of*

Hodie vero cum passim omnia reliquia sanctorum plena videntur, verendum est, ne si Episcopi & Principes in veris reliquijs inquirendis & diiudicandis eam quam debent operam abhiberent, ingentes & detestanda impossura pateficerent, quemadmodum in nonnullis locis factum est, vt olim in Aeterno accidit.

Reliques of Saints, as it is assured above of Bishops and Princes would take that pains that they should do, to search for and to examine which are true reliques, great and detestable impostures would be found, as it hath happened in some places: and as heretofore it happened to Saint Maxime, who going to a place of his Diocesse, famous because of the sepulcher of one whom they reported to be a martyr, found that the people revered and came, not to the sepulcher of a Martyr, but of a wicked biese, which he presently caused to be razed and pulled down to the ground. This testimonie out of the mouth of one of our aduerfaries is verie considerable.

Confutation of this worship of Reliques by the word of God.

213. Sect.

Besides the places of Scripture produced in the precedent Sections, whereby we are forbidden to give any worship, or to do any religious service to any other but onely vnto God, there are particular places against the worshipping of Reliques.

1. In the old Testament we see that the bodies of the holle Patriarches and Prophets were buried, and put in the sepulchers of their fathers. *Ioseph* dying, ordained that his bones should be kept vntill the people went out of *Egypt*, *Genesis* 50. 25. *Moses* being dead, God would not let the *Israelites* know the place where he was buried, lest they should haue abused it to Idolatrie.

2. In the 1. and 23. of *Kings*, King *Iosias* forbad the people to take vp the bodie of a dead Prophet out of the earth, and willed them to let it lie where it was buried. He made no transportation of his bones, nor did no worship, no service, no offering nor adoration thereunto. The like is said in generall of all the bodies of the Saints, as of *Abraham*, *Isaac*, *Jacob*, *Samuel*, and *David*, whose bones haue not bene

remo.

remoued, worshipped, nor separated one from the other, that diuers townes might haue their parts thereof. S. Peter in the 2. Chap. and 29. verse of the Acts, witnesseth that then in his time *Dauids* sepulcher was to be seene, whose bones were not remoued from thence.

4 In the 2. of Kings. 12. 21. verse, God raised a dead man by touching the dead body of the Prophet *Eliseus*: God by that miracle authorising the authoritie of that Prophets doctrine. Yet for all that it is not found that his body was taken out of his graue, nor laid vpon an altar, nor that the people fell downe before his bones, nor that they brought offerings vnto them, nor that they kissed them, nor carried them about in procession.

5 If any man thinketh that the bodies of the Saints vnder the old Testament were polluted, or lesse holy then the bodies of the faithfull in these times, he is confuted by this example: for if euer any sepulcher of a Saint may be said to haue bene sanctified by God, it was that of *Eliseus*, at the which God shewed forth so admirable vertue. Then the death of the iust was precious before God, as it is said Psalme 116. And our aduersaries themselves do sufficiently shew that they esteeme the bones of the Saints vnder the old Testament no lesse holy then others, seeing they haue some of them yet among their pretended relickes. And at the vtmost this euasion can serue but for the bones of the Patriarches and Prophets, and not for their apparell and moueables, which then were not kept in shrines, as at this day they keepe small rags and torne coates and shirts of the Apostles and other Saints.

6 The Prophet *Esay* 14. and *Jeremie* 22. 19. among the threatnings and curses of God, make want of buriall one. Then how is that which God placeth among his curses, at this day turned into an honour? Why do men take the Saints bones out of the places where they rest? Why are they laid open to the sight of men? Why are they separated and carried to diuers places?

7 And to come to the new Testament, Acts 8. certaine men fearing God, laid the body of Saint *Stephen* which was stoned

stoned into the ground, but worshipped not his body, nor dismembred it not, to separate his bones into diuers places.

8. In the 19. of the Acts many were healed by touching the ketcher and linnen cloathes that came from Saint Pauls body: yet those linnen clothes were not put into a shrine, nor any worship done vnto them. These miracles were not done to cause them to adore those clothes, but to authorise the preaching of the Apostle.

9. The Prophet Esay 8. 19. 20. after he had reprobued diuiners and inchanters which went to the dead to aske counsell for men that liued, saith not vnto them, *Why do you not rather go to the relickes of Saints that are dead*, but sends them to the Law and to the Testimony, if they would be illuminated by the true light.

10. And to be short, touching this worshipping of Relicks; when our aduersaries are pressed to produce one onely place of the word of God for it, they are at a stay, and say nothing. And if they produce any thing, it is rather to mocke God then to instruct men. *Bellarminus* in the fourth chapter of his booke of Relicks, falsely and against all truth, saith; that the holy Scripture approoueth the worshipping or religious seruice done and vied to the Sepulcher of our Lord, to the skirts of his gowne, to the shadow of Saint Peter, and to St. Pauls ketcher. A wise man cannot affirme this vnlesse he speake against his owne conscience: for he knoweth that in the Scripture there is not one word spoken of religious seruice done to those things. And it is a wonder, seeing among the relickes which are worshipped he placeth Saint Peters shadow, that the Church of Rome doth not keepe some peeces of that shadow, as well as of the blowing and breathing of *Ioseph*.

The same Cardinall in the beginning of the third chapter, falsely alledgeth Esay 55. 20. in these words, *His sepulcher shall be glorious*; but according to the Hebrew, it is, *And his nest shall be glorious*. Furthermore a sepulcher may be honored without religious worship.

In the meane time, let the indifferent Reader consider what

9. Ad tertium
Scriptura ap-
probat cultum
sepulchri &
simbria Chri-
sti: Item um-
bra Petri, su-
darium &
funiculorum
Pauli.

what religion that may be, which hideth the writings of the Apostles from the people, and shewes them their bones; which burieth their doctrine, and ynburiegh their bones. As if a sonne should carefully keepe old bootes, or a peece of his fathers skull, and hide away his Testament. The best relikes of Saint *Peters* and Saint *Paul* are their writings diuinely inspired. That which onely should be cherished and sought for, is the onely thing which is neglected: as the Iewes did, who beautified the sepulchers of the Prophets, and persecuted those which followed their doctrine. Wherein marke the policie. For they seeke for and worship the bones of the Apostles in stead of seeking for their writings, because those bones speake not, but their writings speake, and say things that are odious vnto the Papists: as also because in stead of those bones they can haue others, but they cannot make another holy Scripture. And because it is not so easie for them to trafficke with places of Scripture, as with peeces of relikes, whereof they onely sell the sight, and make a trafficke of merchandise, and neuer deliuer it.

THE XXIX. ARTICLE.

As touching the true Church, we beleue that it ought to be gouerned according to the politicke order which our Saniour Christ established: That is, that there should be Pastors and Deacons, to the end that the purity of doctrine may haue his course, that vices may be corrected and repressed, and that the poore and all others which are afflicted may be succoured in their necessities, and that their assemblies may be made in the name of God, wherein great and small may be edified.

The aduersary passeth ouer this Article, and saith nothing to it.

THE XXX. ARTICLE.

Of the Rule and dominion of the Prelates of the Church of Rome.

We beleue, that all true Pastors, in what place soeuer they be, haue the same authority and equall power, vnder one and the same head Iesus Christ; and for that cause that no Church ought to pretend any dominion or seigniorie ouer others.

ARNOVE.

324. Sect.

This Article introduceth anarchie, diuision, disobedience, and disorder into the house of God, and overthroweth the manner to gouerne established by diuine Law in S. Matthew 16. and S. Iohn 20: by contempt of vniou, and subordination, which cannot be without some visible head, such an one as by these words is promised, There shall be one shepfold and one shepheard.

MOVLIN.

Experience confuteth this accusation. The Churches of France which presented this Confession to King Francis the second, haue liued and do liue peaceably and without confusion vnder this gouernment. This order because it is not a Monarchie, is not therefore an Anarchie, seeing that each Pastor gouerneth his focke, and that the Pastors are subiect to a Synod, and the Synod is guided by one Moderator.

It is false that equality overthroweth the forme of gouernment established in Matth. 16. and Iohn 20, for in those places there is nothing spoken of superiority or of subordination. These are the ordinarie falshoods of this Doctor.

Whereas he saith, that a visible head of the Church is promised.

misled by these words, *There shall be one shepherd and one flock*, he doth it rather to mocke the Scripture then to serue his turne therewith. This onely Pastor is not the Pope, but Iesus Christ. This sheepfold gathered together vnder one Pastor, is not the Church of Rome, but the Christian Church composed of Iewes and Gentiles.

And we must know, that the equality of Pastors touching the preaching of the word of God and the administration of the Sacraments, and as concerning the vse of the keyes, is esteemed to be necessary among vs. For Baptisme, and the holy Supper, and the pronouncing of the remission of sins, are of equall dignity in the mouth of all Pastors: whether they be of great or small authority. But as touching Ecclesiasticall policie, we do not refuse to acknowledge those for pure and true Churches, where this equalitie is not obserued: because we esteeme not this order to be a point of faith, nor a doctrine tending to saluation. We liue (God be thanked) in brotherly concord with the neighbour Churches which obserue another forme, and where Bishops haue some superiouritie.

I know that vnder pretence that the Church of England hath another forme of discipline then ours is, our aduersaries charge vs that our religion is diuerse. But experience confuteth this accusation; for we assemble with the English men in their Churches, we participate together in the holy Supper of our Lord: the doctrine of their Confession is wholly agreeable vnto ours. England hath bene a refuge for our persecuted Churches, who, notwithstanding the difference of Ecclesiasticall policie, haue not receiued lesse entertainement. The excellentest seruants of God in our Churches, as *Peter Martyr*, *Caluin*, *Zanchinus*, and *Beza*, haue often written letters full of respect and amitie to the Prelates of England.

He abuseth himselfe which belecueth that the word *Bishop* vsed in the holy Scripture, is odious in our Churches. And our Aduersaries vniustly accuse vs to be enemies of the Episcopall order. For we must be altogether ignorant in Histories, if we do not know that all antiquitie speaks honorably of that decree. *Ensebinus* in his Chronicle witnesseth that

a yeare after our Saviours death, *James* our Lords brother was established Bishop of Ierusalem, and that 10. yeares after, *Eusebius* was created Bishop of Antiochia; and that after *James* succeeded *Simeon* in the bishopricke of Ierusalem, from whence descended the succession of the Bishops of Ierusalem. Saint *Hierome* in his booke of Ecclesiasticall Writers, saith that *Polycarpus* (Saint *Iohn* the Apostles disciple) was by the same Apostle made Bishop of Smyrna. In the same booke he saith, that the Apostle Saint *Paul* established *Timothee* Bishop of Ephesus, and *Titus* Bishop of Candie. And *Tertullian* in the 32. chapter of the booke of Prescriptions, calleth those Churches Apostolicall Churches, and buds or sprigs of the Apostles, whose Bishops were established by the Apostles. Of this function and degree in the Church were the Fathers, whose writings we haue, as *Gregorie Nazianzen*, *Gregorie Nissen*, *Basil*, *Chrysostome*, *Cyprian*, *Augustine*, *Hilarie*, &c. Of whom whosoever doubteth that they had not some superiority, and that to them particularly government of Ecclesiasticall causes did not appertaine, hath no knowledge of Antiquitie.

It is hard in all Antiquitie to find three or foure examples of two Bishops in one towne; for generall custome was against it, which permitted not two Bishops to be together in one towne: as *Theodore*, *Chrysostome*, and *Hierome* vpon the first chapter to the Philippians witnesse, and *Augustine* in his 110. Epistle.

But because we haue no expresse commandement for this superiority in the new Testament, and for that, as experience hath shewed, it hath bene as a match to kindle pride, and hath degenerated into Papall tyranny; as also because the Church of Rome hath changed her bishopricke into a temporall Principalitie, and hath made Episcopall dignitie subiect to the power of the Pope, to whom for many yeares past, every Bishop at his admission tooke an oath of obedience and fidelitie; for these causes, the faithfull seruants of God, which haue trauelled and taken paines to abolish and to purge Papistry in France, in the Netherlands, and in Switzerland, haue sought

These examples are found in my booke of the Voocation of Pastors, l. c. 4.

to reduce the sacred Ministry into the Church, and to abolish the Papal Hierarchie. But in England, where God hath wised Bishops to strive against and to resist Papistry, and where God hath given them soveraign Princes; which maintaine and ypheld them by their power; Episcopall order continueth, and flourisheth at this day. And God hath here raised up and still doth, excellent Bishops; both for learning and pietie, which courageously maintaine Gods cause, both by word of mouth and writing: and some of them also have received the crowne of martyrdome for the confession of the Gospell.

And euen as equalitie is received among vs to shunne ambition and tyrannie, so England hath reiected this equalitie, to auoyd confusion and contempt of the Ministerie. They say, and that with good reason, that no societie, no familie nor common-wealth, can prosper without some degrees of superioritie: and that it is so among the Angels, and in the government of the vniuersall world. That God established degrees of superiority in his Church vnder the old Testament. They say, that to place a man of little capacitie, and newly received into the Ministerie, in like degree with an ancient Minister of the Church, whom God hath endowed with more gifts, and which hath serued long time in the Ministerie with commendation, is a meanes to nourish pride in the yonger, and to dishonour those whom God hath honoured, and to induce confusion: as also that thereby the Ministerie among vs is become contemptible. And that the superiority of the Bishops of England hath bene approued by the most worthy pastors of our Churches, namely *Peter Martyr* and *Bucer*, expressly called into England to help them in their reformation.

All these allegations tend to three ends: one is, to shew that notwithstanding the diuinitie of Ecclesiasticall policie, two particular Churches may liue in peace and concord, and vnder the band of one selfe same faith & religion. The second is, to shew that if sometimes we speake against the authoritie of Bishops, we condemne not Episcopall order in it selfe; but.

but speake onely of the corruption which the Church of Rome hath induced into the Bishopricke, making it a temporal principallitie, depending vpon the Papall Throne. The third is to shew, that there shall neuer be any forme of discipline which hath not some dangers euilable in it, and which hath not some discommodities. That therefore is the best which approacheth nearest to the simplicitie of the Apostles and the discipline of their times, and which in such sort shunneth ambition, that thereby order may be maintained, and the dignitie of the Ministerie no way contemned,

ARNOVL

135. Sect.

Places of Scripture noted in the Margent of the Confession. 2. Cor. 1. 14. Not that we haue dominion over your faith, but we are helpers of your joy. Matt. 18. 2. 3. 4. Iesus having called vnto him a little child, and set him in the midst of them, said, Verily I say vnto you, Except you be converted, and become as little children, you shall not enter into the kingdome of heauen. Who-soeuer therefore shall humble himselfe as this little child, the same is the greatest in the kingdome of heauen. And 20. 26. But it shall not be so among you, but whosoever will be great among you, let him be your servant. And 1. Peter 5. 3. Not as though ye were Lords ouer Gods heritage, but that you may be examples to the flocke. All these places recommend humilitie in those which are called to Ecclesiasticall functions.

MOVLIN

That is true; but by recommending humilitie, he bindeth vs to shunne all occasions of pride, and by consequence, Lordly dominion and rule ouer our brethren.

To those places we must adde these; Matth. 23. 8. But be ye not called Rabbis, for one is your Doctor, to wit Christ, and ye are brethren. And Luke 22. 24. 25. 26. And there arise also a strife among them, which of them should seeme to be the greatest. But he said vnto them, The kings of the Gentiles reigne ouer them; and

and they that rule over them are called Bountifull. But ye shall not be so, but let the greatest among you be as the least, and the chiefest as he that serueth.

ARNOVX.

These places (as it appeareth by the onely reading of them) 116. Sect. presuppose a superioritie, which wanting, such aduices should be giuen in vaine.

MOVLIN.

Those aduices which forbid the affectation of superioritie do not necessarily presuppose that there is a superioritie. By the same reason prohibitions to commit adulterie, should presuppose that necessarily there must be adulterers.

ARNOVX.

Contrary places of Scripture. Matth. 13. 11. Our Lord speaking to his Apostles the true Pastors, said, He that is greatest among you, let him be your servant. 127. Sect.

MOVLIN.

This place is falsely quoted, there is no such thing in the 11. verse of the 13. chapter of Matthew. It is a place taken out of the 20. of Matth. vers. 25. 26. but set downe in other termes. This is the place truly cited: Ye know that the Lords of the Gentiles haue dominion ouer them, and they that are great exercise authoritie ouer them: but it shall not be so among you. But whosoener will be great among you, let him be your minister: and whosoener will be chiefe among you let him be your servant.

He that alledgeth things vpon other mens report, is subiect to fall into such faults. But let vs see what he will inferre vpon this place.

ARNOVX.

Do you not see, that these two things are not vnlke: to be the greatest of all by reason of the charge which authoriseth the commandement, and yet servant vnto all, in regard of humilitie and charitie, 128. Sect.

is, whereby he hath that charge, not preferring himselfe in his heart before any man, doth sacrifice himselfe for the good and welfare of those which are committed to his charge.

MOVLIN.

132. Saint Mathew saith not, *He that is the greatest*, as *M. Arnoxe* maketh him say, but, *Whosoever will be the greatest*. And if it were, *He that is the greatest*, that may be understood of him which is the greatest in knowledge, or in age, or in order of sitting, without superioritie of iurisdiction.

I confesse, that greatnesse and humilitie agree very well; he that hath attained to soueraigne greatnesse, hath no other meanes to increase the same but by humilitie: for that his humilitie is so much the more commendable, because he hath more temptations to pride. But his humilitie must not be ambitious, seeking by contempt of honour, to make himselfe more honourable. Such is the Popes humilitie, which walketh poore mens fete, and makes Emperours kille his fete; which calleth himselfe servant of servants; and makes himselfe king of kings, giuing and taking away kingdomes. Which calles himselfe Christs Vicar, and sets Christs Crosse vpon his pantoffe. Which falleth downe before the host, and makes it to be carried about in procession vpon a little nag or curtall horse, whereas himselfe is carried vpon Princes shoulders. If that be called humilitie, a man can hardly tell what pride is. But to imitate *M. Arnoxe* eloquence, I aske if the Pope behauing himselfe in that manner, doth sacrifice himselfe for the welfare of those which are committed to his charge? doth not our Doctor with his childish eloquence rather sacrifice himselfe to the publike laughter of all all men?

Of Saint Peters Supremacie.

ARNOXE.

129. Sol.

And Mathew 10.2. Now the names of the twelue Apostles are these:

*these: The first, Simon called Peter. Could he more formally
speake against the Article which establisheth equalitie?*

MOVLIN.

Saint Peter might be the first in age, or in zeale, or in knowledge, or in eloquence, or in vertue, or in prioritie of order and precedence, without power of iurisdiction over the rest of the Apostles. We reiect not this inequalitytie, and our Article saith nothing against it.

Now, that Saint Peter had no superioritie nor power of iurisdiction over the other Apostles, neither was head of the vniuersall Church, the Scripture sheweth it so clearly, that he that denies it must strue against his owne eyes, and belie his owne sense and reason.

1 We haue two Epistles written by Saint Peter, wherein there is not one word which soundeth or sauoureth of his soueraigntie. His manner of phrase therein is not the phrase of a maister or of a superiour. He giueth himselfe no other title, but an Apostle of Iesus Christ, and an Elder. Doth a Soueraigne write long Letters to his Subiects, without once shewing himselfe to be a Soueraigne, without taking any quality of a Prince vpon him, or without any command?

2 And when the Apostles stroue among themselves about the Supremacie the day before Christs passion, the Lord said not vnto them, Why do you dispute about Superioritie, seeing you may remember that I haue already giuen the Supremacie to Saint Peter? but he onely said vnto them; *The Kings of the Gentiles reigne ouer them, but it shall not be so among you*, Luke 22. Then was the time or neuer to command the Apostles euery one to keepe in his order, and not to disturbe Saint Peter in his Supremacie. But in the 27. of Saint Matthew he saith, *But be you not called Rabbi, for one is your Doctor, to wit, Christ, and ye are brethren.*

3 In Acts 8. the Apostles sent Peter and Iohn to preach in Samaria. Would the Pope at this day take such a commission? would he subiect himselfe to other Bishops that should send him to preach in Swizzerland or in Poland?

4. Now

4. How many times in the Scripture are the other Apostles set before *Peter*? as in 2. Galathians, *James*, *Cephas* and *John*, which are esteemed pillars. And also Saint *John* 1. 44. putteth *Andrew* before *Peter*, saying, *Philip* was of *Bethsaida* the Citie of *Andrew* and *Peter*. And 1. Cor. 9. 5. The Lords brethren and *Cephas*: a manner of speaking which at this day would be hardly taken, if we should put the Bishop of *Paris* before the Pope of *Rome*.

5 And 1. Cor. 3. 4. it is said, that among the Corinthians some said, *I am of Paul*; another, *I am of Apollos*; others, *I am of Peter*. An evident prooffe, that neither *Paul* nor *Apollos* had taught the Corinthians to acknowledge *Peter* to be the head of the vniuersall Church. For those that said, *I am Pauls*, without doubt would haue beleeued *Paul*, and by consequence would haue acknowledged *Peter* for head and superior to *Paul*. For *Paul* would haue taught them to honour *Peter* more then himselfe.

6 Which appeareth by the reproofe which *Paul* gaue them thereupon. For he said not, why do you say that I am of *Paul* rather then of *Peter*, seeing that *Paul* told you that he was subiect to *Peter*? But he sends them to Iesus Christ the onely head of the Church, saying, *Is Christ diuided? was Paul crucified for you? or were you baptized in the name of Paul?*

7 The same Apostle, 2. Cor. 11. 5. saith, verily *I suppose that I was in nothing inferior to the very chiefe Apostles*. Saying in nothing he excepteth nothing, to the end that men should not say, that Saint *Paul* vnderstood onely that he was not lesse then *S. Peter* in doctrine, or in the charge of preaching the word, or administring of the Sacraments. Therefore Saint *Hierome* in his Commentary vpon the second to the Galathians, bringeth in Saint *Paul* comparing himselfe in this sort with Saint *Peter*: *I am nothing inferior vnto him, for we are established in the ministerie by one and the same God.*

8 Saint *Paul* in Gal. 2. 6. saith, *For they that are the chiefe, did adde nothing vnto me*. Saint *Peter* therefore gaue not power to Saint *Paul*, nor conferred any authoritie vpon him,

9 The same Saint *Paul* saith, *That the preaching of the Gos-*
pel

*In nullo sum
illo inferior,
quia ab uno
Deo sumus in
ministerio or-
dinati.*

polle of the uncircumcision was committed unto him, as the Gospel of the circumcision was committed to Peter. Therefore those two Apostles parting the labour betweene them, the one preached to the Jewes, the other to the Gentiles. It would be a notable example, and worthe of Apostolicall humility, if a Bishop should diuide halfe the charge with the Pope. And yet the charge that fell to Saint *Paul* was of more importance. For what comparison was there betweene an handfull of Jewes committed to Saint *Peters* charge, with all the rest of the world? Which by the way sheweth, that Saint *Peter* did not reside in Rome, for then the Jewes were banished from thence, as Saint *Luke* witnesseth, Act. 18. 2. And Saint *Peter* to preach to the Jewes, would not haue chosen a towne to reside in where there were no Jewes.

10. And a little after in the ninth verse the Apostle saith, That *James*, and *Peter*, and *John*, which are accounted to be pillars, gave him and *Barnabas* the right hands of fellowship, that is, they received them for companions. Is there any Prelate at this day that dares call the Pope his companion? Note also, that *Peter* is not onely named after *James*, but also that *James* and *John* are esteemed pillars of the Church as well as Saint *Peter*. As also in the Councell of Ephesus there is an Epistle of the Councell of Alexandria inserted, which saith, that *Peter* and *John* are of equal dignitie one at the other.

Petrus & Iohannes aequales sunt ad alterutrum dignitatem.

THE XXXI. ARTICLE

Of the vocation of Pastors.

We beleue that no man of his owne authoritie ought to thrust himselfe into the government of the Church: but that it ought to be done by election, if it be possible, and that God will permit it. Which exception we adde, specially because it hath sometimes fal-

lenious; and what in our time (wherein the state of the Church was corrupted) that God raised vp men by extraordinary meanes, to erect the Church againe which was fallen into ruine and desolation. But howsoeuer it be, we beleue that we must alwayes be conformable to this rule; that all Pastors, Ouerscers, and Deacons, ought to haue testimonie that they are called to their offices.

130. Sect.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT.

This is the Article whereby they take vpon them the reformation of the Church which was lost and desolate, without producing any promises, or Prophecies of so notable and general reformation in all capitall matters of Beliefe, nor any witnesses of their extraordinary power, nor any miracles which make them acceptable; in times past Iesus Christ, and Moses in the like occasions by word, nor any succession or dependence whereby they haue ordinary commission.

MOVLIN.

For the vnderstanding of this Article, you must consider that it is the Churches of France which speake; and that by consequence, by restoring of the Church, we only vnderstand the reestablishment and reformation which God in our time hath brought to passe in France, and not what hath bene done in the vniuersall Church: & therefore the aduersarie hath no reason to require of us prophecies which promise so notable a reformation: for the holy Scripture speaketh not of France, nor of any accidents that should happen therein. To be assured of a thing it is sufficient to see it, although we cannot shew that God foreshewed it. If we must beleue nothing that hath happened in our age, vnlesse we can shew that God foreshewed it by prophetic, we must not beleue that the Pope in our times hath deposed our kings, and moued the Frenchmen to rebellion. We must not beleue the innovations of the monke Iulius, nor the miracles of Saint Iohn de

la croix, nor the coming of the Iesuites. It is true that the Revelation forebesheweth the massacres and persecutions of the faithfull: and that the whore clothed in scarlet, sitting in the towne which hath seven hills, shall make kings drunke: the Apostle also forebesheweth, that the sonne of perdition shall call himselfe God, and shall boast of miracles: and that false Doctors shall come, which should teach abstinence from marriage and from meates. And the holy Spirit forebesheweth vnto vs, that God will raise vp a few faithfull witnesses, which shall preach with great affliction in spirituall Sodome, vntill such time as the Beast shall kill them. But these predictions are not for the Churches of France onely, which in this Article speake of that which is particular vnto them.

Touching the vocation of faithfull Pastors, which God hath extraordinarily raised in our times to fight against Papistrie, the clearing of this matter dependeth vpon knowing what the vocation of the Pastors of the Church of Rome is. Wherein there are two sorts of vocations of Pastors, whereof the one is none, the other corrupted. The vocation of Popes, terming themselves heads of the vniuersall Church, and the vocation of Cardinals, are no vocations, as being humane constitutions contrarie to the word of God. And the vocation of Bishops and Priests therein is corrupted. According to the word of God, their charge is to preach the word, to administer the sacraments, and to gouerne their flockes. But the Priests charge is changed into the office of a sacrificer of the bodie of Christ, and the charge of a Bishop is the charge of a Prince of the Popes temporall monarchie, as appeareth by the oath which Bishops make at their admission, which is inserted into the *Romane Pontificall*, wherein there is no mention made either of God or of his word, but it is an oath which a subiect maketh to his soueraigne, or a vassall to his feodatic Lord.

Among this corruption this good onely remaineth, that when the Bishop admitteth a Priest, he sheweth him his dutie, and the nature of his charge, saying, *The Priest must blesse,*

As a

a The Reader may see this oath at the end of my booke of the Vocation of Pastors.

b *Sacerdotem oportet benedicere, praedicare, & baptizare,*

a Sic doctrina
 ue doctrina spi-
 ritualis medi-
 cina populi
 Dei. Sic odor
 uis uestra
 delectamentis
 Ecclesie Chri-
 sti, ut predica-
 tione atque
 exemplo ad fr-
 uctum ducam
 Dei.
 d. Pro ea que
 ex dictis
 Scripturis in-
 telligitur probum
 emendandum
 est, & uerbis
 diuini & eu-
 angelii. Psal-
 m. Accipe E-
 uangelia, &
 uale & pra-
 dica populo ti-
 bi commisso.

he must be generous, he must preach, and he must baptize. And a little after, ³ Let your doctrine be a spiritual medicine to the people of God. Let the favour of your life be a rejoicing to Christs Church, that by preaching and good example you may build up the house of God.

The same obligatorie words to teach the pure doctrine of the Gospel, are spoken to the Bishop. Where the consecrator asketh the future Bishop, saying, ⁴ We aske thee, whether thou wilt employ thy wisdom, as much as thy capacity serueth thee, to the honour of the holy Scriptures. And after that, ⁵ Wilt thou both by words and examples teach the people, vnder whom thou art establisht, that which thou understandest out of the diuine Scriptures? Whereunto the future Bishop maketh answer, and saith, *Yea, I will.* Then laying downe the Bible before him, he saith vnto him, ⁶ Receive the Gospel, and preach vnto the people committed to thy charge.

These are ancient things, remaining entire among hor-
 rible corruptions, to the end that they may serue to touch the
 consciences of those that should take that charge vpon them,
 and that that good which remaineth may serue to correct
 or to condemne that which is euill. Now it so fell out in our
 fathers times, that certaine persons called to the charge and
 offices of Priests, Doctors, and Bishops, hauing by the word
 of God knowne and found out the abuse of the Papacie,
 sought to accomplish their oathes, and called to remem-
 brance the nature of the charge wherein they were establisht,
 and in the same seates began to change their speech, and to
 preach the truth. They made use of that good which was left
 in that corrupted function; God intending in that reforma-
 tion to employ those which had the visuall charges receiued
 in the Churches of their countreies, to the end that they might
 be the better receiued and esteemed of by the people, and
 that their vocation might not be denied or controuerted. For
 if the Church of Rome hath no lawfull vocation, why doth
 she require that in another which she her selfe hath not? If she
 hath lawfull vocation, then those whom they question haue
 the same vocation. And it is herein all one as if in the Arrian

or Nestorian Churches, a Pastor hauing acknowledged his error, should take vpon him to confute Arrianisme, and to preach the true faith; and that therefore the said heretickes should molest him, and aske him saying, Where is thy vocation, and where are thy miracles to authorise thee? That is in effect as if they should say vnto him, Who gaue thee charge to keepe thy oath which thou madeest at thy admission? And where is thy vocation which authoriseth thee to be faithfull vnto God?

Hereupon they aske vs, whether those faithfull Pastors who in our fathers times put their helping hands to reformation, had ordinarie or extraordinarie vocation. The answer is, that they had that vocation which was ordinarie, and vsuall in the Church in their countries. But because the doctrine and the vocation of their Church was corrupted; besides that ordinarie vocation, they had an extraordinary commission. For touching the ordinarie and vsuall charge in the Church in their countries, they retained that which therein was good, that is, their duties to preach, and purely to administer the Sacraments. But they had this extraordinary, that God employed them to preach contrarie to their intentions which ordained them, as being contrarie to the intention of Iesus Christ the first author of that vocation. And this extraordinary commission being well considered, is no other thing but the ancient ordinarie charge. It is inueterate corruption which causeth their enterprise to seeme extraordinarie, as health seemeth to be new, after a long disease or sicknesse of bodie.

We must not thinke it strange, that a man hauing an ordinarie vocation, should by God be employed in an extraordinarie worke. The holy Scripture furnissheth vs with many examples thereof. *Jeremie, Ezechiel, and Iohn Baptist* were Leuites and Priests hauing ordinarie charge in the Church, and neuertheless were by God employed in extraordinarie commissions, and to that end were extraordinarily assisted by the Spirit of God. I say not, that their vocations were halfe ordinarie and halfe extraordinarie, but that they had their ordi-

narie vocation fully and wholly, and that besides the same, they were inspired with the holy Spirit for an extraordinary worke. Such were the faithfull servants which God raised in our fathers times. But it is to be understood, that the ordinarie vocation of *Servants, Teachers, and Iohn Baptist*, was pure and entire; but the vocations of these were corrupted; which corruption by custome grew for a Law; but they leaving the abuse and shaking off the yoke of the Popes tyrannie, which endeavored to subiect all ordinarie vocation to it selfe, converted that corrupted vocation to the right vse thereof.

We must no more thinke it strange, that an idolatrous and corrupted Church should conferre a vocation which should be sufficient to binde a man duly to performing the office of a Pastor; or all oathes made concerning things that are iust and holy, whereinto a man hath not intruded himselfe; ought inuolably to be observed. Now in hereticall and idolatrous Churches, Pastors are received and admitted vpon promise to teach the truth. And withall, every hereticall Church hath the charge of the first institution; and by the intencion of the people, ordained to preach the puritie of the Gospell. Therefore the Councell of Nice in the 8. Canon ordained that hereticall Clerkes, that had any charge among the Getharists, or Novatians, vpon their conversion to the catholicke Church, should remaine in the same degree that they were in. Onely it ordained that they should be received againe by imposition of hands, which was an imposition of hands not of ordination but of simple benediction; whereof there are many examples in the new Testament. The 69. Canon of the Code of the Affrican Councels, ordaineth that the Donatist Clerkes should be received into the clergie of the catholicke Church, and remaine in their first dignitie. Which is the subiect of Saint Hieromes Dialogue against the Luciferians, where he proueth, that as the Church received those which had bene baptized by the Arians, so she ought to receive those Bishops which converted from Arianisme, without taking their dignitie from them.

But hereby the Church of Rome hath no aduantage of vs,

as

* Act. 13. v. 3.

Mat. 19. v. 15.

Ad id genus
vnde dicitur in
de vbi dicitur
de modis et
ordinis et
vnde dicitur
vnde dicitur
vnde dicitur
vnde dicitur

as if we drew our vocation from her. For herein we giue no more authoritie to the Church of Rome then to the Arrian and Nestorian Churches, seeing that we say that the most corrupt Church of all others; and wherein there is no saluation, loseth not her power to conferre a vocation, which although it be corrupt, neuerthelesse it bindeth a man to do his dutie, specially when he is admitted vpon oath to teach the truth. The principall point is, that those reformers of Papacie obserued that which was good in their bad ordinarie vocation, not from the Prelates which had consecrated them after the Romish manner; but from Iesus Christ and the Apostles, from whom these callings were first deriued. Euen as when the water of a cleare spring comes to vs through an vncleane channell, the infection commeth onely from that channell, but the water comes from the spring and first originall thereof which comming thicke and troubled vnto vs, our labour is commendable if we seeke to make it runne cleare. It is one thing to haue a vocation by the meanes and ministerie of the Church of Rome; and another thing to haue it from the Church of Rome, and from her authoritie. The authoritie of the calling comes from Iesus Christ and the Apostles, and not from polluted hands through the which it hath past. The obligation to keepe a mans oath, comes not from him to whom the oath is made; but from God to whom we sweare, who onely hath the power in his hands to punish perurie. Therefore, if I promise a man to do two things, the one holy and iust, the other wicked and contrarie to the word of God, that mans authoritie cannot binde me to offend God; by keeping that which I haue euilly and rashly promised. Promises made against God do not bind. An oath ill made is worse to be obserued. Therefore all the oathes made by Priests and Bishops vnto the Pope, are void and of no force; but the promise which they make to preach the truth of the word of God, bindeth them, and is inuolable.

That which is said before being well considered, is a sufficient answer to that which they aske vs, which is, What miracles the first reformers did to authorise their extraordinary

vocation. For this question ought not to be put to those which haue had the ordinarie vocation vsed in the Church in their countries. Besides there were diuine Prophets extraordinary raised, whom we find not to haue done any miracles, as *Osee, Michea, Malacby, &c.* *An euill and an adulterous generation seeketh after,* Mat. 23. 39. And if those reformers of Papistrie had done miracles, their enemies being resolute to contradict them, would presently haue said, that it was of them which Iesus Christ said, *There shall arise false Prophets, shewing signes and wonders,* Math. 24. 24. Mark. 13. 22.

To conclude, all the meanes that our aduersaries helpe themselves withall in this question, is a thife of a slight to hinder vs from examining their doctrine. They busie vs with disputing vpon formalities, to keepe vs from entering into the ground of the cause, with the same policie by the which the high Priests and Scribes asked Iesus Christ and his Apostles the reason of their vocation. They busie vs about callings, thereby to diuert vs from the examination of doctrine. It is necessarie indeed that a Pastor intrude not himselfe, and that he be duly called: but it is not absolutely necessarie for the good of the people, that they should exactly know the vocation of their Pastors: they shall not be answerable for that at the day of iudgement, but they are to give an account of the obedience which they haue yeilded to the pure word of God, though it were preached by an usurper, whose usurpation may be unknowne to the people. For there is no man so foolishly scrupulous, which had not rather be led into Paradise by a man without a calling, then to be drawne into hell by a man laden with titles, hauing an ordinarie vocation.

But the iniustice of our aduersaries specially appeareth herein, that they will haue all vocation in the Church to depend vpon the Pope, which is one of the greatest abuses in the Church of Rome, and hath most need of reformation. By this reckoning we must haue our vocation from the Pope, to preach against the Pope. And we must be silent vntill such time as some good Pope finds some men expressly to preach against himselfe.

But that which was most necessarie for them to do, that is, to let the people see the originall of Ecclesiasticall functions, and to shew them that Iesus Christ instituted sacrifices of his body, this is the thing which they neuer do, and which they will not once touch; and for feare lest the people should look clearly into it, they hide the holy Scripture from them, which onely gouerneth and directeth Ecclesiasticall vocations, and propoundeth vnto vs the first institution thereof.

ARNOV.

They note no places of Scripture in the margin for prooue of 131. Sect. this exception, nor of this necessitie, nor of this circumstance of time, nor of the pretended interruption, nor of new raised up, nor of the extraordinary manner, nor of restoring the Church, nor of one onely word of the Article.

MOVLIN.

To proue that in our time God raised certaine persons by an extraordinary manner, and that reformation was necessarie, our Confession produceth not any place of Scripture in the margin of this Article, because that by places of the Scripture we proue the points of our beleefe, but not what happened in our time in France; which are points contained in moderne histories, and no Articles of faith. It ought not to seeme strange, if in the Confession of our Churches there are some points inserted which are no Articles of faith. For as the title of the Decalogue is, *The ten Commandments of God*; and yet these words, *I am a mighty God, jealous, visiting the iniquities of the fathers, &c.* and these words, *In six dayes God made heaven and earth*, are not Commandements, but reasons whereupon God groundeth his Commandements: so in the Confession of faith it was necessarie to insert some things which are not Articles of faith, but which serue to shew a reason why it was necessarie for vs to oppose our selues against the Romish faith, by a contrarie confession of faith.

Touching the rest, all the places of Scripture quoted in the margin.

margent of our Confession from the beginning to the ending touching those Articles which are in controuersie, are as many proofes and reasons, to shew why in our time the reformation of the Church of Rome hath bene necessarie.

ARNOV.

Of the perpetuall stabilitie of the Church of Rome.

132. Sect.

Because motion is made to put the Church of Rome from her possession, and to shew that Iesus Christ having once given himselfe vnto her as an inheritance, which she hath held so many ages, as they confesse, hath withdrew himselfe from her: Or that she being inheritrix of life, can die: and of the truth, can lie; and likewise of the way, can erre and be lost.

MOVLIN.

In all this discourse there is not one true word, nor yet common sense. It is false, that we go about to put the Church of Rome from any possession. We come to helpe the Church of Rome, and she complaines that we would take her goods from her: she vnderstands aide to be iniury. For those that gouerne her, feare that the Gospell will diminish their riches and great wealth: and that is the possession for the which they dispute.

It is false also, that we euer confessed that Iesus Christ gaue himselfe for an inheritance to the Church of Rome, in that sence which our aduersary meaneth. By the Church of Rome, we vnderstand the Church of the Citie of Rome, to the which Iesus Christ neuer gaue himselfe for an inheritance in other sort then to the Church of Corinth, Ephesus, or Constantinople. He made his covenant with those Churches with threatnings to take it away, and to remoue their candlestickes in case of contempt or rebellion: a mischiefe which hath happened to the Church of Rome. Life and truth are riches

riches whereof the Church of Rome neuer was proprietarie, although in the first age of the Church it was one of those Churches which professed the word of God. The riches thereof which from age to age haue increased therein, by perverting of manners haue peruerter doctrine. For it hath bene forced to wrest the doctrine to make it appliable to vices, to build an Empire, and to giue a particular Church the title and properties of the vniuersall Church. And if *M. Arnoux* will haue the Church of Rome to be seized in perpetuities of truth and life, without erring or falling away, he ought to produce places out of the Scripture which confirme this prerogative vnto her. For there is no Church in the world how wicked soeuer it be, which may not also bragge, and say of it selfe, that it cannot erre nor be ouerthrowne. So the Iewes conspiring against *Ieremie*, said, *The Law shall not perish from the Priest, nor counsell from the wise, nor the word from the Prophet*, *Ierem. 18. 18.* But God maketh them liars therein, saying, *The Law shall perish from the Priest, and counsell from the ancient*, *Ezechiel 7. 26.* So Babylon speaketh sitting vpon seven hills, and exercising a trafficke or merchandise of soules, *Apoc. 18. 7.* *I sit like a Queene, and am no widow, and shall see no mourning.* Note this word *sit*, for that is the word which the Popes vse to denote their dominion. To conclude, to say I cannot erre, is the worst of all errors. That Church which saith I cannot fall by error, is already fallen by pride, and lyeth, in saying she cannot lie. In saying, that she is the Rule, she exempreth her selfe from all rule, and her fall is the lesse recoverable, because that being fallen, she still thinketh that she stands vp-right. Neuerthelesse, to proue that the Church of Rome cannot erre, behold what places of Scripture our aduersarie setteth downe.

ARNOUX.

Daniel 2. 44. the Prophet speaking of the Christian Church, under the word Queene, saith thus, And in the dayes of those kings shall the God of heauen set vp a kingdome, which shall neuer be destroyed, and this kingdome shall not be left to another people, but it shall 133. *Sect.*

shall break in pieces and consume all these kingdomes, and it shall stand for ever.

MOVLIN.

In this place there is no speech of a Queene, nor yet of the Church of Rome. The Prophet speaketh of a kingdome which shall endure for ever. Which is understood of the kingdome of the Saints, and the elect, who shall reigne with Iesus Christ eternally in heaven, as Daniel himselfe declareth, 7. 18. saying, *And the Saints of the most High shall take the kingdome, and possesse the kingdome for ever, even for ever and ever.* If the Church of Rome be eternall, then after the day of iudgement there must be Popes eternally on earth.

ARNOVE.

134. Sect.

And Exodus 4. 1. *Moses making Effinitiers to go unto Pharaoh to reforme him, and saying, They will not believe us, nor hearken to my voyce, for they will say, God hath not appeared unto thee. God gave him power to worke miracles, adding the reason, To the end that they may believe that the true God appeared unto thee.*

MOVLIN.

If by these two places *M. Arnoxe* pretends to proue that the Church cannot erre, he doth according to his accustomed manner, which is *inst quilibet ex quolibet*. As when before he proued that the Church is visible, because it is written, *That God hath placed a penitition in heauen for the Sinne*, Psalme 109. And that she is Apostolicall, because it is written, *God doth iustice to the orphane and to him that is oppressed*. But if by this place he will proue the necessitie of miracles, he digresseth from the question, for this hath no connexion with that which goeth before. Touching miracles we haue before spoken at large, and in the Section following we will speake more. But where did he learn, that *Moses* was sent to *Pharaoh* to reforme him? To bring the Israelites out of *Egypt*, is that to reforme *Pharaoh*, or the religion of *Egypt*?

MOVLIN.

ARNOVL.

And Iohn 10. 37. If I do not the workes of my Father, beleue me not. To conclude; neither the Sonne of God, nor the Apostles, nor Moses, nor Elias, euer took on them to appeare, as being sent in an extraordinary manner, without having markes of their authoritie from God.

MOVLIN.

Our Saviour said, *If I do not the workes of my Father, beleue me not.* Touching that, we haue already said, that as the miracles done by Moses still serued to authorise the Law; even after miracles ceased in Israel: so miracles done by Christ and by the Apostles, still serue in this day to authorise the Gospel, although miracles haue ceased. When king Iosias openly shewed the booke of the Law which had bene lost, 2 Kings 21. he did no miracle, because he propounded no new thing, but reestablished the ancient doctrine of the Law, sufficiently authorised by miracles at the publication thereof in Horeb. It belongs to them that teach new doctrine to do miracles. *False Prophets shall rise up, and do great signes and miracles,* Mat. 24. 24. *The sonne of perdition shall shew signes and lying wonders,* 2. Thess. 2. 9. *An euill and an adulterous generation seeketh a signe.* Matth. 12. 39. To those that shall say vnto Iesus Christ, *Haue not we in thy name cast out diuels;* it shall be said, *Depart from me, I neuer knew you;* Matth. 7. 23. These are places which seeme to haue bene written expressely of our aduersaries, whose miracles at this day are all reduced to the casting out of diuels. For to restore sight to a man that was borne blind, or to raise a dead man to life againe, there is no speech of such matters, their art extendeth not so farre. To conclude, all this is grounded vpon a false supposition that we haue no ordinarie vocation. Those which besides their extraordinarie commission haue ordinarie vocation, need no miracles to authorise it. Now this extraordinarie commission is grounded vpon the necessitie of reforming the Church of Rome, and vpon the euident corruption of the ordinarie vocation.

THE XXXII. ARTICLE.

Of the Confession of faith.

We also beleue, that it is good and profitable, that such as are chosen to be Superintendents, should take order among themselves what means they should vse for the government of the whole bodie, and yet in no sort to decline from that which is set downe vnto vs by our Lord Iesus Christ. Which hindereth not but that there may be particular orders and ordinances in euery place, as necessary requireth.

Our Adversary by his silence approoeth this Article.

THE XXXIII. ARTICLE.

Of Ecclesiasticall policie.

Notwithstanding we exclude all humane inuentions, and all lawes which men introduce vnder shadow of the seruice of God, whereby they would binde mens consciences. But onely we receive such as serue to nourish concord, and to keepe all both high and low, in obedience. Wherein we are to follow that which our Lord Iesus Christ declareth touching excommunication, which we approve and confesse to be necessarie, with all that appertaineth thereto.

ARNOXX.

136. Sect.

That is to shake off the yoke of Lawes and ordinances, as well of the Church the Spouse of Iesus Christ, as of Magistrates, to be which

which they beleene, that they must not obey but by policie, and for order, not for conscience sake.

MOVLIN.

This Article tendeth not to shake off the ordinances of the Church of God, but the ordinances of the Papall Church, whereby a tyrannicall yoke is laid ypon mens consciences, and Christian libertie oppressed.

Touching obedience due to Magistrates, there is nothing spoken thereof in this Article, that is referred to the last Articles of our Confession, where we shall see the contrarie to that which *M. Arminius* imposeth vpon vs. For there we say, that God hath established kingdomes and Principalities, that he will be knowne to be the author thereof, that we must obey them for Gods sake, and that he will haue vs to pay them tributes, imposts and other duties, &c. It is therefore a foule slander which our aduersarie imposeth vpon vs, to say, that we beleue that we must not obey kings but by policie, and for order, and not for conscience sake. The Apostle *Paul* Rom. 13. 5. suffereth vs not to doubt thereof, when he saith, that *We must be subiect vnto higher powers, not because of wrath onely, but also for conscience sake.*

But what is the cause that when in this Article we speake of humane inuentions, *M. Arminius* thinketh, that vnder those humane inuentions we vnderstand the obedience which we owe to Magistrates lawes, but onely because he esteemeth the power of Magistrates to be a humane inuention, and not a diuine ordinance? and hereafter in another place he calleth it a humane law. That is the opinion of the Doctors of the Church of Rome. *Bellarmin* maintaineth against *Barkley*, that the power of kings is not *de iure diuino*. That was the apophthegme of *Barn* the Iesuite, speaking to *M. Casaubon*, saying, *That it was better that all kings were, than that a Confession should be denied: because confession is by diuine law, but the power of Princes is by humane law, as the said M. Casaubon witnesseth in his Epistle written to Fronton le Duc the Iesuite,*

ARNOU.

137. Sect.

For if they speake of but vniuersall Lawes made by vniuersall Magistrates, they needs not frame an Article for that matter in a Confession of faith, where all things are succinctly and succinctly for the Church of God.

MOVLIN.

In this Article of our Confession, we neither speake of but vniuersall Lawes of Magistrates; for in it we speake not any thing of the Magistrate. Howbeit vnder these words of vniuersall Magistrates, the lesuite comprehends lawfull Magistrates: for they thinke, that to kill a King which is deposed by the Pope, is not to kill a King, because they esteeme him no more a King, howsoever he reignes actually; whereof we will speake hereafter.

ARNOU.

138. Sect.

The Catholique Church in her French men, that the most Christian King of France is composed of two houses, the Spirituall and the Temporall: the left is built upon the Rock which is the ground, and the right is built upon the holy Sea which is the chiefe corner stone: and in either of those two houses they are bound as Christians and Catholique Frenchmen, as well to the Lawes of the Church as to the Kings Lawes, and to the Ministers and Officers thereof.

MOVLIN.

All this discourse concerneth not our Article; wherein there is nothing said of Magistrates howbeit at this discourse sounds ill in the mouth of lesuites, who place murderers of Kings in the role of Martyrs: witness the Table which with mine owne eyes I have seene in the Colledge de la Fleische in the Fathers hall, where among Iustitiell martyrs, there are diuerse which haue bene executed for such parricides.

Therefore *M. Arnou* ought to abstaine from this matter,

for

for the honour of his Order, and call to minde the iudgement against *Iohn Chastel*, and the punishment of *Gnignard*, and the refusal which the Iesuites make yet at this day, by writing to condemne this proposition, that the Pope cannot depose a King: and rather to stay vpon the substance of our Article, wherein we speake not of obedience due to Magistrates, but of Ecclesiasticall discipline and policie, and specially of Excommunication.

But he will be sure not to meddle therewith, lest he should giue vs occasion to lay open the abuse, and the profanation of the vse of the Keyes, which the Sonne of God hath giuen to all the Apostles and to their successors, which are the faithfull pastors of the Church.

Of the Excommunications of the Church of Rome.

The Church of Rome makes Admonitions and Excommunications to serue for the finding againe of things that are lost. He that hath lost an horse causeth an excommunication to be published against him that hath stolen it, if he bring it not againe. Whereby it happeneth sometimes, that a father causeth his sonne to be excommunicated not knowing in and for the body of an horse, causeth his sonnes soule to be deliuered to the diuell. The Councell of Trent in the 23. Session approueth these Excommunications made to find things lost: but will haue none but Bishops to publish them.

They do worse then that: for they excommunicate for future time; and for sinnes not yet committed. That is, the Bishop pronounceth or causeth a writing to be pronounced, signifying thereby, that he excommunicateth all those that shall touch the rockes or trees of the Lord of a towne or village, although no man hath once laid hand vpon them.

At the request of a creditor that hath a desire to be paid his money, they excommunicate a debtor if he payeth not within a certaine time.

139. *Se. 7.*

Tolent. lib.

1. De instru-

ctiōe sacer-

dotali ca. 8.

Fertur excom-

municatio in

rum qui ali-

quid alteri

surreptit.

Tolent. lib. 1.

De instru-

ctiōe sacer-

dotali ca. 8.

Futimatur

in futurum

Tolent. lib. 1.

De instru-

ctiōe sacer-

dotali ca. 8.

a Emen. Sa.
Aphorismi in
voto excommu-
nicatio. Regis
a solo Papa ex-
communican-
tur & cen-
suris ligantur.
b Telet. In-
struck. sacer-
dot. 1. c. 5. Fa-
mina excom-
municatio po-
terit excommu-
nicatio Papa, &
notant Pavor.
& Antonius.
c Papa man-
dat ut aliqui
excommunicat
sine aliqua
cognitione
causa.
d Causa 11.
Quest. 3. Can.
Sententia por-
torum, sine
iusta sine in-
iusta, timenda
est.
e Telet. lib. 1.
Instr. sacer-
dot. 1. c. 3. Excommu-
nicatio non
potest exerceri
alium iuris-
dictionis abs-
que potestate,
immo si pub-
licam excommu-
nicatio a
Ga. sententia
nolle sunt

The Pope onely excommunicateth Kings; and censureth them: as *Emanuel Sa* the Iesuite saith: in his Aphorismes. The example of *Ambrose* disliketh him; who being but Bishop of Millane; durst take vpon him publickely to suspend *Theodosius* the Emperour without communicating the same to the Bishop of Rome.

The Pope can giue power to a Lay man, yea and to a woman, to excommunicate; as Cardinall *b Toler* after *Pauromitana* and *Antonius* saith. For the keyes which are spoken of in the Scripture are not tied to the preaching of the Gospell, therefore diuers persons vse them which cannot preach the Gospell.

The Pope also may giue commission to any one to excommunicate a man, without shewing him the cause or reason wherefore he doth it. As the same Cardinall saith, in the 16. chapter of the first booke of the Instruction of Priests.

And if the Pope excommunicateth any man vniustly, (for they all confesse that he may iudge amisse, because he may erre in action, and condemne him that is innocent, to be culpable) yet Pope *Gregorius* the 1. declareth, that the sentence of a Pastor, whether it be iust or vniust, is to be feared.

But that which in this matter is most pernicious is the common rule, that an excommunicated person is suspended of his charge, and cannot exercise any act of Iurisdiction, and that all the sentences which an excommunicated Iudge pronounceth, are of no force. By this rule the Pope pretendeth that he hath power to depose Kings, and to displace the Officers of the Crowne, and all Iudges, as well soueraigne as inferior, whom when it pleaseth the Pope or the Prelates to excommunicate them; their acts, ordinances, and iudgements are of no effect, (if we beleue the maxims of the Romish Church) and by consequence their places must be supplied by other persons the Popes friends, that their iudgements may be available.

Our Kings and their Officers and Courts of Parliament, are dealt withall in the like vniust manner in the Bull *de Canonicis Dominis*, which is a solmne excommunication which the

Pope

Pope thundreth out every yeare on Maundy thursday before Easter, Vpon which day the Pope appeareth standing in a Porch of a gate, with two Peacockes tailes on each side of his eares or head, and there in the presence of the people being assembled about him in Saint *Peters* Pallace, he pronounceth a long excommunication; wherein expresly he nameth the Chancellors, Presidents and Counsellors of the Courts of Parliament, ordinarie Iudges, and extraordinary Commissioners; as also Emperours, Kings, Dukes, &c. which shall appeale from the Pope to any future Councell: or that lay or impose new taxes and tallages vpon their subiects without speciall permission from the Pope: or that take tithes of the Clergie: or that in any sort take knowledge of Ecclesiasticall causes. By which clauses of excommunication, our Kings, and their Officers, and Courts of Parliament, are intrangled, who every day crosse and contradi& those prohibitions; and for recompence of so many good deedes which the Pope receiue from them, are excommunicated by the Pope, and every yeare sent to hell by the strongest and most solemne excommunication which is made in the Church of Rome.

Our Churches in this 33. Article declare, that they approve not of excommunications made for things that are lost, nor to molest men that are in debt, nor for future sinnes not yet committed, but for scandall and rebellion against the Church, and perseuerance in impenitencie, according to Iesus Christs commandement, who speaking of him that had wronged his brother, ordained, that if he despised the admonitions of the Church, he should be esteemed as a Pagan or an Infidell, and by consequence, put out of the communion of the faithfull. For in the verse following, he giueth faithfull Pastors power to bind and to loose sinnes, with promise that their iudgement shall be ratified in heauen. Which power the Apostle Saint *Paul* will haue the *Corinthians* to vse against the incestuous persons, 1. Cor. 5. 3. saying, *Put a way that wicked person from among you.*

140. Self.

ARNOUX. These two doth contain
*Places of Scripture alledged. And those that are alledged, in my
 judgement are rather referred to certain words which are lower in
 the Article, as that of Rom. 16. 17. and 1. Cor. 3. 3. where the A-
 postle exhorteth Christians to shunne partialitie, and nothing else.*

MOVLIN.

The 33. Article of our Confession saith, that we receive
 that which serues to nourish concord; and thereupon noteth,
 Rom. 16. 17. where the Apostle saith, *I beseech you brethren,
 mark them diligently which cause division and offences. And
 1. Cor. 3. 3. For where as there is among you enuie, and strife, and
 division, are you not carnall?* Nothing can be quoted that is fitter
 to the purpose.

ARNOUX.

141. Self.

*These places are nothing to the purpose to weaken the force and
 vigour of humane lawes, which are good; and made by those whom
 God hath established; but serve only to appease seditions; and to
 breake ciuill factions.*

MOVLIN.

I grant that those places may be fitly vrged against fediti-
 ous and quarrelsome persons; and we alledge them to no o-
 ther end; not to dispence with humane lawes, I meane such
 as *M. Arnoux* vnderstands by humane lawes, to wit, the or-
 dinance of God to obey kings, calling that a humane law,
 thereby to embase the authoritie of our Soueraignes, by per-
 swading vs that their authoritie is not deriued from the di-
 uine Law of God.

ARNOUX.

142. Self.

*Contrary places of Scripture. Luke 10. 16. He that heareth
 you heareth me, and he that despiseth you despiseth me, and he that
 despiseth me, despiseth him that sent me.*

MOVLIN.

Our 32. Article reiecteth humane inventions. But in this
 place

place of Luke 10. 16. which *M. Arnonx* opposeth against vs, our Lord Iesus Christ commandeth to obey the Apostles and all faithfull Pastors which speake in his name. Which if *M. Arnonx* placeth among humane inuentions, I know not what else is diuine. Therefore this place is so farre from making any thing against our Article, that it is little lesse then blasphemie to wrest it to establish humane inuentions.

ARNOX.

And Rom. 13. 2. Whosoener therefore resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God, and they that resist shall receiue to themselves condemnation. And verse 5. Wherefore we must be subiect, not because of wrath onely, but also for conscience sake. Therefore we cannot say that the obseruation of humane lawes belongeth not to the service of God, nor binde the conscience. 143. Sect.

MOVLIN.

Humane lawes, that is, humane inuentions, and mens traditions, which corrupt pietie, burthen mens consciences, and draw money from the people vnder pretence of deuotion, are condemned by our 33. Article. But touching obedience due to Magistrates, whereof the Apostle speaketh, we call it not a humane law, but a diuine constitution. *M. Arnonx* which calleth it a humane law, offendeth the Maiestie of our Kings, and vnder a shew to exhort men to obey them, undermineth their authoritie.

FINIS.

Bb 3

THE



THE SECOND PART
OF THE DEFENCE OF THE CON-
FESSION OF FAITH MADE BY THE
Reformed Churches of France:

WHEREIN THE DOCTRINE OF THE
*said Churches touching the Sacraments of the Christian
Church, and the Power and authority of Magistrates,
is maintained, against the objections of M.
Arnoux the Jesuite.*

THE XXXIII. ARTICLE:

*Of the Confession of the faith of the refo-
med Churches.*



WE beleue that the Sacraments are ad-
ded to the word for ampler confirma-
tion, to be pledges and tokens of the
grace of God, and by that meanes to
helpe and strengthen our faith, because
of the infirmities and hardnesse of beleeve which is in
vs: and that they are in such sort exterior signes, that
by them God worketh through the power of his Spi-
rit, that nothing by them should be signified to vs in
vaine. And yet we beleue that all the substance and
truth.

truth of them is in Iesus Christ: and that if they be separated from him, they are nothing but shadowes and smoke.

The Aduersarie passeth ouer this Article, and approueth it by his silence.

THE XXXV. ARTICLE.

Of the number of Sacraments.

We confesse onely two Sacraments, and those common to all the Church, whereof the first, which is Baptisme, is giuen vnto vs for a testimony of our adoption, because that thereby we are ingrafted into the body of Christ, that we might be washed and cleansed by his blood, and after renewed in holinesse of life by his Spirit. We also belecue, that although we are but once baptized, that the benefit which thereby is signified vnto vs, extendeth both to life and death, that we might haue a permanent signe or seale that Iesus Christ will alwayes be righteousnesse and sanctification vnto vs. Now although it be a Sacrament of faith and repentance, neuertheless because God receiueth little children together with their parents into his Church, we say, that by the authoritie from Iesus Christ, yong children begotten by faithfull parents, ought to be baptized.

ARNOVV.

After they haue cutt off part of the Scriptures by the 3. Article, 1. Sect. the merits of workes by the 22. Article, and workes of perfection.

Bb 4

by

by the 24. Article, they proceed further to the cutting off of the Sacraments practized in all times in the Church of God, according to the institution of Iesus Christ.

MOVLIN.

We haue cut nothing off from the holy Scriptures: for we cannot cut that off which was neuer of them. The bookes of *Iudith, Tobias, Machabees, &c.* are not found in the Hebrew Bibles, which are the originall of the old Testament. Moreover, they are full of fables, as we haue proued. The Church of Rome is the onely Church that dares be so bold to cut off the Scripture, taking the second Commandement of the Law of God out of it in their Ladies Houres and Seruice bookes.

Touching merits by which God is made debter to men, and touching workes of perfection which are called supererogatorie, whereby a man exceeds the Law of God, and doth more good then God will haue him to do, we reiect them, because God reiecteth them, as we haue proued before in the 70. Section of the first booke.

Touching the Sacraments, we receiue all those which Iesus Christ hath ordained: and reiect the Sacrament of Confirmation, the Sacrament of Penance, the Sacrament of Mariage, the Sacrament of extreme Vnction, and the Sacrament of Orders: because they are no Sacraments of the orthodoxall catholike Church, but of the Church of Rome. Of each of which it is necessarie that we say something.

Of the pretended Sacrament of Confirmation.

2. *Scil.*
Council. Trid.
Sess. 7. cap. 9.

Confirmation is a Sacrament of the Church of Rome not to be reiterated, which ought to be celebrated fasting, which imprinteth an Indelible character in the soule, and which is not conferred but by a Bishop: wherein there are godfathers and godmothers, betweene whom and the child that is confirmed,

firmed by that Sacrament, there is a spirituall parentage begotten, which hindereth marriage, and which also causeth the dissolution of marriage, notwithstanding the prohibition made by Iesus Christ, forbidding the dissolution of marriage vnlesse it be for adultery, saying, Matth. 5. 32. and 19. 6. 9. *Let no man therefore put asunder that which God hath coupled together.* &c. Neuerthelesse the Pope by speciall priuiledge sometimespermitteth a man to marry his gossip: as it is said in the booke of the Taxing of the Apostolicall Chancery, where the Datarie of the Popes Bulles which hath made this tax, speaketh in the 23 leafe, saying, * *A dispensation to contract marriage betweene spirituall kindred costeth 60 groats, neuerthelesse I granted one for 50 groats; but that was done by fauour.*

This Sacrament is administred in this manner: A child is presented to the Bishop by a godfather if it be a sonne, or by a godmother if it be a daughter. The Bishop sits downe, washeth his hands, layeth them vpon his breast, and sayes certaine prayers, by the which he asketh or requireth the seuensfold spirit. Then he asketh the godfather the childes name, and dipping his right thombe in the sacred oyle, which is called Chrisme, which they bring in a bottle, whereon the Bishop breatheth to sanctifie it, speaketh to the oyle, saying, *Aue Chrisme, I salute thee Chrisme.*

That done, the Bishop annoints the childes forehead therewith in manner of a crosse, saying, *Signo te signo crucis, & confirmo te chrismate salutis, in nomine Patris, Filij & Spiritus sancti.* I marke thee with the signe of the crosse, and confirme thee by the Chrisme of saluation, in the name of the Father, &c.

After that he giues the child a blow on the eare to strengthen him in the faith, then he kisseth it, and hauing rubbed his thombe with crums of bread, after many signes of the crosse by him made, he commands the godfathers and godmothers to teach the child the Creed, the *Pater noster*, and *Aue Maria.*

While this is doing, the child if it can stand vpright, setteth his right foote vpon the right foot of his godfather or godmother,

Pontificale e. De confir. Hoc Sacramento contrahitur

spiritualis cognatio impediens matrimonium contrahendum, & dirimens contractum.

Idque contra Decretum Concilij Cabilonenfis. 2. c. 31.

** Dispensatio de contrahendo in cognatione spirituali gr. 60. Expediunt tamen vnam pro gr. 50. sed de gratia.*

mother if it be a daughter. The action ended, they bind the child's forehead with a cloath, and vpon the band put certaine golden spangles in manner of a crosse, and so the whole action is ended.

*Namquam
vis Christi-
anum nisi in Co-
firmatione E-
piscopali sue-
ris Christia-
nus.
a Hoc Sacra-
mentum est
perfectum
Baptismi.
b Maiori vene-
ratione vene-
randum est &
tenendum.
c Sed ita con-
iuncta sunt
has duo sacra-
menta, ut ab
inuicem nisi
morte preue-
niente nulla-
tenus possint
separari, &
vnum sine al-
tero perfecti
non possit.
§ Denique, Id-
circo sam ra-
tione Ministri
quàm ratione
subiecti, præ-
stat Confirma-
tio Baptismo,
ut rectè dicit
Magister.
Vide Ceterum
Augment. en-
chiridij de Sa-
cramentis. Confirma-*

Touching the efficacie and fruite of this Sacrament, the Canon *Omnes*, in the 5. Distinction of Consecration, saith, That all the faithfull ought to receiue this Sacrament, *¶ pleni Christiani inueniantur*, to the end they may be found to be full Christians; as if without that Sacrament they were but halfe Christians. Therefore also in the same Distinction, in the Canon, *¶ si ieiuni*, it is said, *That he shall neuer be a Christian, which hath not bene anointed by Episcopall Confirmation.* Following this doctrine *Thomas* the Angelicall Doctor, in the third part of his Summes, 72. question, Article 9. ^a saith, *This Sacrament is administred to giue perfection to Baptisme*, as if without Confirmation Baptisme were imperfect. Therefore also the rules of the Romish Church import, that this Sacrament ought to be more honourable then Baptisme: as it is expressly said in the Canon *De his*, in the fift Distinction of Consecration, which saith, ^b *This Sacrament ought to be reuerenced and obserued with greater reuerence then Baptisme.* Neuerthelesse, to mitigate the matter there is added ^c *That these two Sacraments are in such manner conioyned, that they can by no meanes be separated one from the other, vlesse death preuent them, and that the one cannot be perfect without the other.* Then by this reckoning, Baptisme is either nothing or imperfect without Confirmation.

Bellarmine in the first chapter of the booke of Confirmation, maketh Confirmation worthier then Baptisme in three things, first, *Ratione Ministri*, In consideration of him which administred it, which ought to be a Bishop, but Baptisme may be administred in the Church of Rome by a porter and by a woman. Secondly, *Ratione subiecti*, in consideration of the subiect, that is, of the part of the body, for Confirmation is done in the forehead. Which are two comparisons as wisely made, as if a Prince hauing giuen a peny for an almes, and a subiect hauing giuen 20. crownes, I should say, that that peny

is of more worth then the ten crownes, because of the quality of the giuer, and because the one layd the penny vpon the poore mans head, and the other put the ten crownes into his hand. Thirdly and lastly, he will haue Confirmation to surpasse Baptisme, *Ratione virtutis*, because of the vertue, which is the principall point. For in the beginning of the 11 chapter, he saith, that this Sacrament conferreth a grace which maketh the person acceptable, yea a greater grace thē that which is conferred by Baptisme, as touching this point to fortifie the soule against the assaults of the diuell. To that end the blow on the eare serueth. Which being so, I maruell why Iesus Christ would be baptized, and did not thinke vpon receiuing of the Sacrament of Confirmation.

The 25. Article of our Confession, by receiuing none but Baptisme and the holy Supper for Sacraments in the Christian Church, silently reiecteth this Sacrament of Confirmation, as iniurious to Baptisme, seeing that the Church of Rome in the places aforesaid, is not content to make Baptisme inferior in dignitie to Confirmation, but also accuseth Baptisme of imperfection, adding a Sacrament thereunto, without the which men are but halfe Christians, and which supplieth the want and imperfection of Baptisme.

But I will passe over all these trifles of ceremonies, which haue a shew of coniuration. Our aduersaries, to proue this Confirmation by the Scripture, say, that Iesus Christ the same day when he instituted the holy Supper, taught his Apostles to consecrate the Chrisme which they vse in Confirmation: * *Ep. ad O. orientale.*
 which is some dreamers tale: whereupon neuerthelesse the custome in the Church of Rome to consecrate the oile on thursday before Easter day is grounded. This fable is found in a Decretall of * *Pope Fabian*, the which (as others of the three first Ages) is acknowledged to be false by the wisest among our Aduersaries. This is rather to mocke then to defend the cause, that they ground their Confirmation vpon this, that the holy Spirit descended vpon the Apostles in forme of fierie tongues. From whence they inferre, that a Bishop ought to annoint and strike a child to strengthen him.

* *Baron. tom. 9. ad annum 861. Sect. 5. 6. 7. quas dubias esse non dubium est. Item, Illis aduentibus & recens inuentis non eget Ecclesia.*

him in the faith. *Tobias* Dog might as well serue for a prooffe thereof. But our Aduersaries mistake themselves. They haue no better reason to ground their Confirmation vpon Acts 8. 16. and 19. 6. of the same, where the Apostles laid hands vpon certaine persons that were already baptized, who by that laying on of hands receiued the holy Ghost. For is there any thing spoken of Chrisme or Vnction in those places? which is the essence of this pretended Sacrament; for in the very forme which they vse in Confirmation there is mention of these things, as also of the blow, and of the head-band, and of such inuentions. The Imposition of hands by the Apostles, was not to celebrate a Sacrament to perfect or strengthen Baptisme, but to conferre miraculous and extraordinary gifts, as it is said Acts 19. 6. *After Paul had laid his hands vpon them, the holy Ghost came on them, and they spake the tongues, and prophesied.* The same appeares Acts 8. where *Simon Magus* offered money, perceiuing that by imposition of hands the Apostles gaue the holy Ghost; which he could not haue seene, if some visible and extraordinarie miracle had not bene shewed. Certainly he would haue given nothing for the Confirmation of the Romish Church. Those extraordinarie graces were sometimes conferred before Baptisme, as to *Cornelius* and his familie. Which makes *Bellarmino* in his booke of extreme Vnction, cap. 2. to say, that Confirmation was given to *Cornelius* before Baptisme: a thing neuertheless forbidden in the Church of Rome.

Acts 10. 44.

47.

Touching the word Sacrament, if any man will call this imposition of hands by the Apostles a Sacrament, we will not contest with them touching that, for it was a sacred signe of the graces of God, as of old the Serpent of brasse, & at this day the Rainebow are the like. But they are not Sacraments in that strict sence in which the word Sacrament at this day is taken; that is, for a sacred signe of Iesus Christ, and of his graces, common to all beleeuers, and perpetuall in the Christian Church. Of such Sacraments we acknowledge but two, that is, Baptisme and the Lords Supper, because Iesus Christ ordained but these two. Saint *Augustine*, in his 118. Epistle
9. chap.

9. chapter, 3. booke of Christian Doctrine, restraineth himselfe to these two Sacraments; and it is vsuall with him to say, That the Sacraments of the Christian Church issued out of our Lords side, when blood and water came out of it.

Saint *Ambrose* his booke of Sacraments speaketh but of Baptisme and the Eucharist. When the Fathers call other ceremonies Sacraments, they take that word in another generall signification, whereby they call the Gospel a Sacrament, and the Incarnation a Sacrament, and to be short, all other things wherein there is any sacred misterie.

The ceremony of ancient Christians to impose hands with vnction, was not a Sacrament apart, but was done at the time of Baptisme, presently after Baptisme was done, if it were possible. For the manner was, that the Catechumens were baptized by troupes. And in the same place, after they were baptized, they receiued the vnction with imposition of hands by the Bishop, and were exhorted to perseuerance in faith. Which was no part of Baptisme, but a dependance and a ceremonie, nothing like to the Confirmation practized in the Church of Rome. The Supplement of *Philastrius* puts this among the errors of the Greekes, to wit, that they hold the Pope and all the Latin Churches for excommunicated, and that they consecrated Confirmation presently after Baptisme.

The Church of England retaineth that which is commendable in this custome, where Confirmation is no other thing but a profession which the child (having attained to the age of discretion) maketh to keepe the promise which his god-fathers and godmothers made in his name when he was baptized, and answereth touching his faith and instruction: which done, he receiue the Imposition of hands, and the blessing of the Bishop: which ceremonie is not called nor held by them a Sacrament. Our Churches in stead of that, cause children to be presented at Chatechizing, and to answer publicly touching their faith, before we admit them to the holy Supper: which is done with prayer, that it will please God to extend his blessing on them. Which customes being of their nature free touching exterior forme and order, the end there-

* Sacramentis numero paucissimis, observationes facillimi, significatione praestantissimis, societatem noni populi colligunt, sicuti est baptismus, Trinitatis nomine consecratus, et communicatio corporis et sanguinis ipsius, & si quid aliud in Scripturis Canonice commendatur.

Græci heretici, qui Pontificem & Latinos omnes habent pro excommunicatis sacramentum confirmationis parulis suis mox post baptismum conferunt per simplices sacerdotes.

thereof ought to be the welfare and instruction of those which are in that manner received, together with the edification of the Church.

Of the Sacrament of Penance.

The word *Repentance* in French, and the word *Penance* in Latin, are all one thing. Penitence is the conversion of a sinner, which consisteth in griefe for his finnes fore-past, and in amendment of life in time to come. The Hebrewes call this vertue, a Returning vnto God, and the Greekes, an After-mind and changing of the will.

The Church of Rome, to pervert the thing, hath corrupted the signification of the word. For Penitence in the Church of Rome is taken for whippings, fastings, pilgrimages, and corporall and pecuniarie punishments. Of a vertue they have made a punishment: and of a repentance of the heart, a corporall exercise: according to the manner of false religions, which change vertues into outward shewes, and into corporall exercises, whereof the Apostle 1. Tim. 4. 8. saith, *Bodily exercise profiteth little; but godlinesse is profitable to all things, which hath the promise of the life present, and of that that is to come.*

Zachar acknowledging this abuse, preached, that the best Penance of all is for a man to amend his life, and to become an honest man. For which heresie, among many the like, he is blasted with thundrings and excommunications, in the Bull *Exurge* of Pope *Leo the 10.*, which is at the end of the last Councell of Latran, where he is condemned, for saying that *the best Penance is a new life.* In which Sentence of condemnation Iesus Christ himselfe is comprised, who, *Apocalypse 3. 19.* speaketh thus to the Church of Ephesus, saying, *Remember therefore from whence thou art fallen, and repent, and do the first works.* In the Romish translation it is, *Agge penitentiam*, do Penance. Which Iesus Christ maketh to consist in the study of good workes.

The difference betweene vs is not, whether Penance be necessarie to saluation, and whether we must confesse our finnes and turne vnto God by earnest repentance: but whether this Penance is a Sacrament or a sacred signe, wherein a contrite sinner ought punctually to confesse his finnes to his Curate, from him to receiue iudiciall absolution, vpon condition to make satisfaction vnto God by corporall or pecuniarie Penance, which whosoever doth not accomplish in this life, shall accomplish it in Purgatorie, from whence neuertheless the Pope drawes out mens soules by Pardons.

We say, that admit there were noe ill at all in this, and that this kind of Penance were conformable to the word of God, yet it can in no wise be a Sacrament: Our reasons are these.

1. All our aduersaries with vs acknowledge, that every Sacrament is a sacred and a visible signe of an inuisible grace of God. The Romish Decretall in the second Distinction of Consecration, maketh this definition of a Sacrament, drawne out of Saint Augustine: *A Sacrament is a forme or visible appearance of an inuisible grace.* And this sentence of Saint Augustine is receiued among our aduersaries, That the word ought to be added to the element to make it a Sacrament. That being granted, it is manifest that this Penance is no Sacrament: for where is the element? where is the visible signe instituted by Christ? for they compose this Sacrament of foure peeces, which are, Contrition, Confession, Absolution, and Satisfaction. Contrition of the heart is no sensible nor visible signe. Confession also is no signe of the grace of God, but a declaration that we are vnworthy of his grace. Confession is not ordained to signifie the grace of God, but to aske it. Moreover the sacred signes ought to be administred by the Pastor, but Confession is made by euery particular man. I say the same of corporall or pecuniary satisfactions, which are accomplished by the sinner, and commonly in his house, by fastings and whippings, or abroad by pilgrimages: whereas sacred signes are administred in the Church, by the hands of the Pastor. Absolution also cannot be a sacred signe of the
Can. Sacramentum est inuisibilis gratia visibile forma.

grace of God: seeing that if it be good and available, it is the grace of God. Adde hereunto, that this absolution is not an element nor a visible signe of an invisible grace, for the words are not scene. If they answer, that it is sufficient that significantly it is the grace of God, I say, that by the same reason the preaching of the word of God is a Sacrament, for it is sensible, and a signification of the grace of God. It is not sufficient that Sacraments should be sensible signes, they must be visible, as the definition aforesaid saith, which is drawne out of the ancient Fathers, and receiued by the Church of Rome. The word must be ioyned to the element, but here they will haue the word to be an element.

I confesse, that the imposition of the Priests hands is a visible signe, but it is no element but an action, as the distribution of the bread in the Supper is not the element, but the bread sanctified. Moreouer this imposition of hands was not ordained by Iesus Christ, for he did not command that the Priest should lay his hands on a man to conferre Sacramentall absolution. If these words, *absolue te, &c.* be a visible signe, or a sensible element, by the same reason these words in Baptisme, *Baptize te &c.* should be a sensible signe, and an element, and not a word added to the element to make it a Sacrament. Certes in disputing with our aduersaries we are constrained to speake as it were to children, to beate into them the first principles of reason and common sense.

The proofes which follow are no lesse plaine and euident. Our aduersaries make Contrition of the heart the first part of this Sacrament, which Contrition and griefe of heart is so necessary, that without it Penance is a kind of mockerie, and a meere hypocrisie. But thereby they wound and overthrow their imaginarie Sacrament: for besides the absurditie therein found, which is to make a vertue or a disposition of the soule part of a Sacrament, as if one should make saith part of the holy Supper, there is a further matter, which is, that the Priest is vncertaine whether thereby he conferreth a Sacrament, because he cannot be assured of the Contrition of the sinner, and knoweth not whether the declara-

tion

tion which the sinner maketh, to be sorry for offending God, be true or fained. And yet if that Contrition be not had, there is no repentance, and by consequence no Sacrament of Penance. Surely this must needs be a presumptuous Sacrament which a man must guesse at, and a Sacrament which dependeth upon the will and disposition of the sinner, who if he will, can make it no Sacrament.

And here also, where all Sacraments are ministered by the Pastor, but of this Sacrament three partes (that is, Contrition, Confession, and Satisfaction) are done by every particular man, who, if he be but halfe contrite, if he maketh but halfe a Confession, if he maketh but halfe Satisfaction, it is but halfe a Sacrament: which are extravagant conceptions, and a strange kinde of an irregular Sacrament.

4 But the grossest absurditie of all appeareth in this, that oftentimes the Priest enjoynes a sinner to make satisfaction within diuerso yeares: in the ancient penitential Canons, there are penances found of 10. and of 20. yeares. Then seeing that this Satisfaction is a part of the Sacrament of Penance, we may say that a man is 20. yeares administering a Sacrament, as if a man should employ 7. or 8. yeares to baptize a child, or to conferre extreme unction. But this is worse: for there are satisfactions which are made by respites, or spaces of time, as when a sinner is condemned to fast three dayes in a weeke, for the space of three yeares. This then is a Sacrament which is celebrated by respites, and hath a thousand delayes: so full of inuention is superstition, and our aduerfaries so ingenious to disguise religion.

5 But to shew the roote of this euill, if Penance be a Sacrament of the Christian Church, then Iesus Christ ordained it. The Councell of Trent in the 14. Session and first Chapter, findeth the institution thereof in the 20. Chapter of Saint John, where Iesus Christ blowing vpon the Apostles, said vnto them, *Receive the holy Ghost, whose sinnes soener ye remitte, they are remitted vnto them, and whose sinnes soener ye retaine, they are retained.* In these words of Iesus Christ, our aduerfaries (which inferre *quidlibet ex quolibet*) finde Auricular Confession,



sion, and pecuniary and corporall Satisfaction.

Math. 3.

Nulla ante baptismum penitentia.

Nec ante adventum Christi penitentia erat Sacramentum, nec est post adventum illius cuicumque ante Baptismum.

Note that these words are spoken to the Apostles after the resurrection of our Lord. Whence it followeth, that repentance preached by the Prophets, was no Sacrament. And in the Gospell, when *S. Iohn Baptist* preached saying: *Repent for the kingdom of God is at hand*, that repentance was no Sacrament, for then Iesus Christ was not risen againe. And which is more, when in *Marka 1. 15.* Iesus Christ said: *Repent, and believe: the Gospell*; that repentance was no Sacrament, for then the Lord was not yet risen againe. And after this resurrection of Iesus Christ, *Acta 2. 38.* when *S. Peter* exhorted the Jewes, (not then baptized) to repent, saying, *Agite poenitentiam, Repent, or amend your lives*; that repentance was no Sacrament: for the Councell of Trent in the same place saith, That Penance is no Sacrament before Baptisme. There is no other Penance found to be in the Scripture, and it is not to be found that this word Penance is proved to be a Sacrament, or an exterior signe of the grace of God, but is said to be an earnest conversion and an amendment of life. With the which Penance if we content our selves, we cannot be blamed for not receiuing other Penance then that which the Prophets, *Iohn Baptist*, Iesus Christ, and the Apostles preached.

6. And if we must haue a Sacrament of Penance, we haue Baptisme, whereof *S. Marke* speaketh thus in his first Chapter, verse 4. saying, *Iohn preached the Baptisme of amendment of life, for remission of finnes*.

Which hindereth not, but that after Baptisme we should seeke to amend our liues, and bring forth fruits worthy of repentance. That also is no hinderance, but that all faithfull Pastors, as successors of the Apostles, may bind and loose: of which power we will speake hereafter.

Of Auricular Confession, a part of the Sacrament of Penance.

Confession of finnes is necessary to saluation. He that con-
fesseth

reth his finnes shall not prosper, but who so confesseth and forsaketh them, shall haue mercy, saith Salomon. So sinners came to *Iohn Baptists* confessing their finnes. This Confession is made, either to God onely, or publickly to the Church, or priuately to the Minister of the Church, or to our neighbours whom we haue offended. All these Confessions are good, and are practised in our Churches: wherein, besides the Confession which euerie one maketh apart vnto God, the Confession of finnes publickly committed and knowne to the most part of the people, are made publickly before the Church: which publicke Confession the Councell of Trent commandeth, and saith, that the Apostle. 1. Tim. 5. 20. ordained it. It was the manner of the ancient Church publickly to confesse their faults. As *Socrates* and *Zozimus* witnesse.

Seff. 24. cap. 8. in Decreto de reformatione, Apostolus monuit publicè peccantes palam esse corrigendos. Sacrat l. 5. ca. 19. Soz. l. 7. c. 16.

Besides this publicke Confession, we haue private Confessions of faults that are not publicke, which are made, either to the Minister alone, when the sinner comes vnto him priuately to discharge his conscience, and to seeke for comfort and assurance of remission of finnes; or to the Consistorie, which is with vs, the assembly of Pastors and Ancients, to whom the managing of Ecclesiasticall discipline among vs belongeth.

Finally there are Confessions of sins, which particular persons mutually make one to another, after they haue offended one the other, of which mutuall confessions *Saint Iames* 5. 16. speaketh saying: *Acknowledge your finnes one to another, and pray one for another.* The Greeke and the Latin word signifie *Confesse your faults mutually and reciprocally.* That which is added, *And pray one for another,* evidently sheweth, that as *Saint Iames* commandeth vs not to pray onely for Priests: so he doth not command vs to confesse our faults onely to Priests. He speaketh therefore of a reciprocall prayer, and of a mutuall succour, as also of a mutuall Confession to be made betweene particular persons after quarrels and offences giuen. So *Saint Augustine* vnderstood it in his 54. Epistle saying, *The righteous are intercessors vnto God for sinners. Sinners themselves are admonished to do it one for another. For it is written, Confesse your finnes mutually, and pray one for another.*

Intercessores sunt apud Deum pro peccatoribus iusti, hoc pro seipsis peccantes iniunctum ut faciant admonentur.

* Nec est hic
sermo de con-
fessione Sacra-
menti, ut patet
ex eo quod di-
cit, cistermini
inulcerum, &c.

ther. Cardinall *Cristian* doth the like in his commentarie vpon this Epistle, saying, " Here it is not spoken of sacramentall Confession, as it appeareth by that which is said, Confesse your finnes one vnto another. But sacramentall Confession is not made one vnto another, but onely to the Priest. The Apostle speaketh of that Confession whereby we mutually acknowledge our selues to be sinners, that we may pray for vs, and of the Confession of faults which are made on either side, to appease and reconcile men mutually together.

If Saint *Iames* did hereby command vs to confesse our sins to the Priest, yet that makes nothing against vs which admit this Confession; we onely reiect auricular Confession, which all the East Church reiecteth; and that racking of consciences which bindeth a man to tell all his thoughts in the eares of a man, and not onely to discover all his finnes vnto him, but also all the particular circumstances, which change (as the Councell of Trent saith) the nature of sinne. Whereof if a man willingly omitteth any thing, the absolution is void, and the Confession without fruite. Besides, the silence of this secret Confession is so inuiolable, that when by a Confession a Priest shall haue vnderstanding of any enterprize to be made against a king, he may not disclose it. No more do we allow of the distinction which the Councell of Trent maketh, which ordaineth that a man shall confesse all his mortall finnes, but touching veniall finnes, (that is, such as are pardonable) it bindeth him not to confesse them. By this meanes a man shall confesse nothing, for mortall finnes are pardonable to those that repent and amend their liues.

The fruite of this auricular Confession is, First that Priests and confessors make themselves fearefull to those whose iniquities they know. Secondly hereby they know the secrets, infirmities, and purposes of Princes, whereof the Pope is presently aduertised. Thirdly, that in a rebellion of subjects against an excommunicated Prince, they perswade bloodshedding and rebellion secretly in the peoples eares, as it happened in the last troubles. Fourthly, that thereby they know all the dishonest women in a towne, and know those with whom

whom they may commit fornication or adulterie without difficultie. Fifthly, that thereby they take pleasure in asking immodest questions, and teach vices vnder pretence of sounding mens consciences, and make enquiry of married mens secrets, whereof also they haue made rules. Reade the 19. booke of *Burcharts Decree*, the *Roman Penitentiall*, *Nunarus*, *Sanchos*, *Emanuel Saars Aphorismes*, and other *Casuists*, *Cardinall Tolets Instruction to Priests*, and the immodest booke of the *Benedictins* touching Confessions. There you shall see a thousand secrets of enormous vnchastitie: the shamefull trickes of Couents, and prophane curiositie: whereby they teach and reduce vices into an Art, as well naturall as against nature, vnder colour to reprove them.

Of Absolution and sacramentall Satisfaction.

Our Lord Iesus Christ hath given power to his Apostles 5. Sect. and to their successors to pardon sinnes, and to bind and lose sinners, *Mat. 16. 19.* and *18. 18.* and *Ioh. 20.* A sinner is bound as long as he is obliged to the punishment due for sinne; and is vnbound when he is absolued; and that his conscience is discharged of that obligation to the punishment in which he was before bound.

This power of faithfull Pastors is exercised, not onely by the preaching of the Gospell in generall, whereby remission of sinnes is promised to all beleeuers and repentant sinners, and the iudgement of God pronounced against all incredulous and impenitent persons: but also by Ecclesiasticall discipline, whereby the penitent sinner is admitted and reconciled to the Church, and the impenitent put from the Communion of the faithfull. Which receiuing or rejecting God declareth to be ratified in heauen, *Matth. 18. 18.* That is the power of the keyes which God hath put into his seruants hands; who pronounce this pardon not, as Iudges, but as Ministers and Heralds of peace and reconciliation; declaring to the penitent

most sinners that his finnes are remitted by the authoritie which God giveth to the Preachers of his word. There is none (to speake properly) but God, that can absolutely forgive finnes. It belongs to the partie offended absolutely to pardon. It is in him to pardon finnes that can punish soules. It is in him to pardon with certaintie, which knoweth the hearts and the interior repentance of sinners. Now there is none but God to whom these things are proper. In the pardon whereby a Priest pardoneth a sinner for an offence by him committed to God, there are two things to be considered, one, that there is no pardon if the sinner doth not earnestly repent; the other, that he himselfe which pardoneth hath need of pardon. Of these two points, the first is the cause that the Priests pardon is conditionall, because he knoweth not the heart: the other is a cause that the Priest should consider of himselfe, that he is rather a delinquent then a Judge: and to teach him to feare, lest that after he hath pardoned others, he himselfe may not obtaine pardon. It is a thing certaine, that if a sinner seriously converting and beleevuing in Iesus Christ, cannot obtaine absolution of his Pastor, which is passionate, or badly informed of the truth, God will pardon him. On the contrary, if a Pastor that is indulgent, and winketh at vices, or that is deceived by apparence of repentance, absolveth an hypocriticall sinner, and receiveth him into the communion of the faithfull, that hypocriticall sinner remaineth bound before God, and shall be punished notwithstanding. For God partaketh not with the errors of Pastors, neither regardeth their passions, nor can be hindered from doing iustice by their ignorance.

* 1. Cor. 9. 11.

2. Tim. 4. 16.

As God in the Scripture saith, * That Pastors save mens soules, because God vseth their ministerie to save them: so Pastors pardon finnes, because God vseth their ministerie to pardon them, giuing efficacy to their words pronounced, either to all men publikely, or privately to sinners confessing their finnes, and thereby imprinting an assurance of absolution in sinners hearts, or thereby aggravating the condemnation of those which despise the pardon by them propounded

ded: this despising being contrarie to God himselfe, who in the same place where he giueth them power to preach, saith, *As my Father sent me; so I send you. Whose sinnes, &c.* The places of Scripture where it is said that Pastors saue men; are. 1. Corinth. 9. 22. *I am made all things to all men, that I might by all meanes saue some.* And 1. Tim. 4. 16. *For in doing this, thou shalt both saue thy selfe and them that heare thee.* Lamberd, the father of the Romish Schoole, ioyneth with vs in his fourth booke, Distinct. 28. saying * *The Lord hath giuen power to Priests to binde and vnbinde, that is, to shew that men are bound or vnbound.*

The absolutions of the Church of Rome, (as well absolution Sacramental, whereby they say that the fault of mortall sinne is remitted, as indulgences or pardons by the which satisfactorie penance is remitted and released) are of another nature.

For their Priests pardon with authoritie of iurisdiction ouer mens soules. And the Pope giues absolutions sealed with lead, in forme of a iudiciall sentence in a Court, although he knoweth not the sinners repentance. He hath reserued the power to himselfe to pardon all sorts of sinnes: and hath limited the power of Bishops and Priests to certaine cases. And vnder the shadow and pretence that it was said to Saint Peter, *All that which thou shalt vnbinde on earth*, he pretends to vnbinde vpon earth, and to draw soules out of Purgatorie, whereby he reapeth great profit.

And vnder pretence, that in the Scripture there is mention made of vnbinding sinnes, he taketh vpon him to discharge men of their othes, and of the subiection and fidelitie which they owe to their naturall Princes, and children of the obedience which they owe to their fathers and mothers, whensoever by dispite or despaire they runne into monasteries, as into a sanctuarie of rebellion. By the same power he dissolueth mariages lawfully contracted, if he find that they haue both bene gossipis at the baptizing of an Infant; or are allied by the sacrament of Confirmation. Which are euident proofs, that the Scripture is alledged by our Aduersaries to vphold

this power, more in mockerie then for any hope that they haue to be beloued.

The absolution of Excommunication, although it be different from that of the sacramentall absolution, yet in regard of the affinde vnto it, deserues a line or two. The abuses therein are enormous.

The Doctors of the Church of Rome teach, that vniust absolution is allowable. Also in the Church of Rome a man is absolved by a Proctor. And there a sinner is absolved when he knoweth it not, yea and against his will, which is as much as to saue a sinner whether he will or not. I haue scene those that haue caused absolution of their sins to come from Rome by bills of Exchange. The same Doctors say, that an hereticke and an excommunicated person may giue absolution at the house of death. Tolet saith it in his first booke of the Instruction of Priests, Chap. 15. That is to say, that an excommunicated person may administer the Communion, and conferre those graces which he himselfe hath not, and whereof (if he had them) God maketh him no distributor.

Emmanuel Sa the Iesuite, in the beginning of his Aphorismes sheweth vs, what words the Priest vseth in giuing absolution. Among other things the Priest saith to the sinners *The passion of our Lord Iesus Christ, and the merites of the most blessed Virgine Marie and of all the Saints; and all the good which thou shalt do; and the euill which thou shalt patiently endure, serue thee for remission of thy finnes, and for increase of grace, and for reward of eternall life.* But the Scripture saith, *That the blood of Iesus Christ cleanseth vs from all sinne.* 1. Iohn 1. 7. And, *That we are iustified freely by his grace, through the redemption that is in Iesus Christ.* Romans 3. 24. And, *That by him God freely pardoneth all our offences.* Coloss. 2. 14. And, *That there is no saluation in any other.* Acts 4. 12. Away then with merites, either of our owne, or borrowed of others; and all trauels and humane perfections whereby men pretend to merite pardon before God. For though in all these workes and labours there were nothing to be disliked, yet they are things which we are bound to do. For he which

oweth

Emm. Sa
Aphorism. in
verbo Excom-
municatio.
Absolutio ex
causa falsa
valet.
Tolet. De In-
str. Sac-
dot. l. 1. ca. 14.
Absolutio in-
iusta valet.
Toletus i.
bid. Potest
absolutio fieri
per procurato-
rem. Homo in-
micus potest
absolui igno-
rans & infirmus
absolutionis.
vide Azor.
li. 1. cap. 9. q. 2.
Emm. Sa in
verbo Excom-
municatio.

oweth an annuall rent, in paying that yeares rent cannot satisfie and discharge his old debts. Moreover, to ioyne these things with the infinite merite of the Sonne of God, is as if a man should tye a blacke coale to a bracelet or chaine of bright shining diamonds, and couple most vnequall things together.

To be short, in what place of the Scripture do they finde one word, to proue, that by our merites, or by the merites of other men, we should deserue pardon of God? That is a new Gospell, a rule of merchandise seruing for trafficke, and a doctrine drawne out of the vnwritten word. The more we stirre this matter, the more the abuse is discovered: it is like a common sincke. The taxe of the Apostolicall Chancery a-teth letters of absolution for every particular sinne at a certaine price, without excepting parricide or incest. And alwayes sinnes committed against the Pope are rated at an higher price, then those sinnes that are directly committed against God. This trafficke extendeth it selfe even vnto the dead. For in the 44. lease of the said Taxe these wordes are found: *For a dead man that is excommunicated, for whom his parents are supplicants, a letter of absolution is sold for a Ducket and wine Carolus.*

*Pro mortuo
incommuni-
cato pro quo
parentes sup-
plicantes, litera
absolutionis
vauit. Duc. 1.
Car. 9.*

And when there is an absolution to be giuen to an excommunicated King, that is done vpon profitable conditions for the Pope, but preiudiciall and ignominious for the King. Sometimes those poore Kings are condemned to certaine stripes in their owne persons; as *Henrie* the second King of England, that was whipt by a number of Monkes: or in the persons of their Ambassadors, as *Henrie* the fourth of famous memorie, our late king deceased, was beaten by Pope *Clement* 8. with diuerse blowes with a staffe, in the person of Monsieur de *Perren* Bishop of Eueux his Embassador. Or else the Pope condemnes them to send certaine troupes of souldiers to aide his Holinesse, and to make their kingdomes tributarie to the Papall Seate, as he did to *Henrie* the second, and to *Iohn* and *Henrie* the third, Kings of England. By these practises he hath impoverished the Emperours of Germany,

and

and brought a puissant Empire into a poore estate, as we see at this day.

§. 14. c.

The Councell of Trent maketh this sacramental absolution vaine and of no effect; declaring, that notwithstanding the faith and contrition of a sinner, yet he ought not to presume that by this absolution his sinnes are truly pardoned, if the Priest at that time had not an intent to absolue him; as oftentimes there are prophane priests, or incredulous, or such as hate those to whom they giue absolution. Now this intent of the Priest is vnknowne, and onely to be presumed on. They also make vaine their absolution by the satisfactorie penances which they impose on men: for, vnloosing the sinner by Absolution, at the same instant they bind him againe by the corporall punishment which they impose vpon him. They pardon him, and in the meane time make him subiect to a punishment. They pardon the fault, and yet constraine him to suffer the punishment. Iesus Christ did not so: for in the 8. of Saint *Iohn*, pardoning the woman taken in adulterie, he onely said vnto her, *Go, and sinne no more*; without imposing any satisfactorie penance either corporall or pecuniarie on her after her absolution. All the Ecclesiasticall censures which the ancient Church vsed and thereby humbled the sinner, were made before Absolution and Reconciliation to the Church. By those exercises of Penitence the sinner satisfied the Church but not Gods Iustice, which Iesus Christ hath fully satisfied.

Yet this is not all, for our Adversaries having imposed satisfactorie punishments vpon a sinner, presently after they dispencc with him for money, and change corporall into pecuniarie punishments, as we haue shewed in the 38. Section of the first booke. *Bellarmino* in the 13. Chap. of his 4. booke of Penitence saith, that the Pope by his pardons dischargeth vs from the obedience of the commandement of God, which saith, *Do not take the name of the Lord thy God in vaine*. That is to profess the Pope before God.

*Indolgentia
faciunt vs pro
penis quas per*

You must also note, that the Councell of Trent will not onely hate those satisfactions to serve to amend the sinner, but

but also to take vengeance of sinnes pardoned. A doctrine which contradicteth it selfe: for God taketh no vengeance after he hath pardoned.

*indulgentias
condonantur,
non tenemur
preceptis de
faciendis dig-
ni penitentia
fructibus.*

Touching cases wherein a Priest cannot absolue, but are re-
ferred to the Bishop, whose power also is limited, many cases
be referred onely to the Pope himselfe, the Councell of
Trent in the 14. Session, groundeth those reseruations vpon
Romans 13. 1. noted in the margent of the said Councell,
where Saint Paul saith, *Qua a Deo sunt, ordinata sunt: Those
things that are of God, are ordained or set downe in order.* From
whence he inferreth, that superior powers ought to reserue
some things to themselves about inferior persons. But this
place is falsified both in fence and words: first in the fence; for
this place of Saint Paul speaketh of ciuill Magistrates which
beare the sword, and not of Pastors of the Church, nor of po-
wers set in ranke and order, but ordained and established by
God. Secondly. In the words, for according to the Greeke
originall it is, *The powers that be, are established or ordained of
God,* and so the French Bible translated by the Doctors of
Louain hath it. With such quotations the margent of that
Councell is filled.

*qui sunt ista
vix deo in de
scriptis quib-
us.*

Those Prelates quoted not Matth. 18. 18. nor Iohn 20. 23.
where Iesus Christ giueth all his disciples equall power to
pardon all manner of sinnes, without reseruing any cases to
Saint Peter, saying, *Whatsoeuer ye bind on earth, shall be bound
in heauen; and whatsoeuer ye loose on earth, shall be loosed in heauen.*

Of the pretended Sacrament of Marriage.

Our aduersaries call the Marriage of Priests and Clergie
then sacriledge, and yet call the Marriage of lay men a Sacra-
ment which conferreth iustifying grace. By this deuice
the Prelates haue drawne the knowledge of matrimoniall
causes to themselves, because it belongeth to the Church
to iudge of Sacraments. It is not to be wondered what great
profit

6. Sect.

profit they reape thereby, and how many persons come to Rome for matrimoniall causes. The same auarice which forbade Marriage to Priests, thereby to preserve the goods of the Church, hath made Marriage a Sacrament, thereby to take the knowledge of matrimoniall causes from the Magistrate. The truth herein is so manifest, that vntreuth finds no place wherein to hide it selfe. For our aduersaries say, that a Sacrament is a sacred signe instituted by Iesus Christ, proper to the Christian Church, whereby iustifying grace is conferred to those which receive it. But nothing of all this agreeth with Marriage.

1 Every Sacrament of the Christian Church was instituted by Iesus Christ. But Marriage was not instituted by Iesus Christ: for Marriage was vsed in the world before Iesus Christ was borne. If they answer, and say, that Iesus Christ changed the nature, or the vse, or the signification of Marriage, and that he ordained that from thence forward Marriage should be a Sacrament, then they must produce that ordinance of Iesus Christ. Which they could neuer yet do: it is a thing drawne from the vntwritten word.

2 Sacraments are remedies against sinne, and aides to our infirmities: Marriage therefore is no Sacrament, because it was ordained before sinne entred into the world, and then when there was no infirmity in man.

3 The Sacraments of the Christian Church are not vsed among Pagans. Marriage therefore is no Sacrament of the Christian Church, because it is vsed among Pagans, whose marriages are lawfull, as the Apostle teacheth vs, 1. Cor. 7. 13. For, counselling a beleeuing wife not to leaue or forsake her husband that is an infidell, he presupposeth that their marriage is lawfull, although it was before the conuersion of the wife vnto the faith. Whereupon *Ambrosius* noteth, that *Iohn Baptist* would not have said to *Herod*, It is not lawfull for thee to haue thy brothers wife, if there had bene no Marriage among infidels. And if a man and a woman that are infidels become Christians, shall their Marriage which was not a Sacrament, become a Sacrament? Or if that be absurd,

and

**Dist. 26. Can. Pna. Tantum est Ambrosio. Io. anm Baptista dum Herodem ab incestu prohiberet, dixit, Non licet tibi habere uxorem fratris sui, cum dicitur ostendit inter infideles coniugia esse,*

and that their Marriage is not a Sacrament after their conversion, shall there be Christians whose Marriages are lawfull, and yet it is no Sacrament?

4 The Church of Rome in effect acknowledgeth that Marriage is no Sacrament, by this, that Marriages are there permitted to be made by a Proctor. For the Sacraments are not administered by Proctors. To baptize a man for another man, and after a man hath for himselfe bene participant of the holy Supper, to participate the same againe for another man, is as much as to make a play of Christian religion.

5 In all Sacraments the word must be ioynd with the element; that it may be a Sacrament; but here there is no element: for neither the words nor the actions are elements.

6 And when a Priest (not knowing it) hath married two persons together, whereof one is defective and incapable of marriage, either he hath truly conferred a Sacrament, or he hath not conferred a Sacrament. If he hath not conferred a Sacrament, then marriage is a Sacrament which dependeth vpon the integrity of the body of those which receive it; and an action which to a man that is entire & sound is a Sacrament, but to a man that is defective is no Sacrament. And so it shall fall out, that the Priest doth that which he thought not to do, and thinking to administer a Sacrament, he administreth nothing. But if those persons have received a Sacrament, what is it when the marriage within short time after is dissolued, by complaint made by one of the parties? That were an vndoing and defacing of a Sacrament, as if Baptisme should be frustrated, or the Lords Supper dismantled, being received by a man that is ill disposed.

7 Adde hereunto, that the Church of Rome holdeth, that Sacraments conferre iustifying grace, *ex opere operato*, that is to say, by the bare action, without the necessarie vertue and holinesse of him that conferreth it; or the attention of him which receiveth it. Let them shew me then what this bare action in Marriage is which conferreth iustifying grace. Is a man regenerated by solemnizatiō of Marriage in the Church? If it be so, how commeth it to passe, that a man then becometh

meth more licentious in superfluity of apparell, bankers, dancing, &c. Is that the iustifying grace which thereby is conferred?

9 If they will that Marriage since the institution made by Iesus Christ, doth conferre iustifying grace, then they must produce the promise made by the Sonne of God, which promisseth this iustifying grace to those that are married. This putteth our aduersaries to a non-plus, and they are faine to send vs to the vnnwritten word.

9 By the Apostles counsell, 1. Cor. 7. 37. one that is continent, and not tempted with euill desires, doth wisely not to marrie. Which should be false if Marriage were a Sacrament conferring grace. For is it a commendable thing to abstaine from a Sacrament which conferreth grace and iustifieth?

10 But why should the Marriage of Patriarkes and Prophets be no Sacrament, and the Marriage of a vicious Christian, which marieth disorderly, and against the will of his parents, be a Sacrament? What more holy or more mysticall thing is there at this day in the marriage of Christians, then was in the marriage of the Prophets and Apostles? For if at this day Marriage be called a Sacrament because it is a figure of the vnion of the Church with Iesus Christ, it signified the same in the old Testament, where that spirituall vnion is oftentimes represented vnder the figure of Marriage: as we see in the 47. Psalme, the Song of Solomon, the 16. of Ecclesiastes, and the first and second Chapters of Osee. And if euer any Marriage was sacred and full of mysteric, it was the Marriage of Adam and Eue. For as God vsed the casting of Adam into a profound sleepe, in the meane time to forme a wife for him, so God vsed the sleepe of the death of the second Adam, to get him a wife, that is, the Church. Or if the Marriage of Christians be esteemed to be a Sacrament, because it is indissoluble, how doth the Church of Rome separate Marriages onely because the parties married did both together present a child at Baptisme, or at Confirmation? Adde hereunto, that the inseparability doth not make a thing to be a Sacrament. If that were so, faith and
repen-

repentance should be Sacraments, because they are inseparable. And it is not found that the Marriages of Christians are more indissoluble then the Marriage of *Adam* with *Eua*, or of *Abraham* and *Sara*. And when Iesus Christ, Mat. 19.8. would abolish the libertie of diuorces vsed among the Iewes, and would restore marriage indissoluble, except it be in case of adultery, he reduceth them to the first institution, and saith, *In the beginning it was not so.*

11 The Apostle Saint Paul, Rom. 4.11. calleth circumcision, *The seale of the righteousness of faith*, shewing thereby, that Sacraments serue not onely to signifie some graces of God, but also to ratifie the same vnto vs, and to confirme the promises of God in vs. If then they will haue Marriage to be a Sacrament, it must not onely be a figure of the vnion of Iesus Christ with his Church, but also it must seale and confirme vnto vs some particular promise of God which is found in his word. But here they are silent, and say nothing that is any thing likely.

12 The Sacraments are tyed together by a naturall bond, one hindreth not the vse of another: but the Church of Rome hath forged two discordant Sacraments, whereof the one impeacheth the vse of the other, that is, the Sacrament of Orders, by the which a man being made a Priest, becometh incapable to receiue the Sacrament of Marriage. and then that Sacrament of Marriage becometh sacriledge and an abomination vnto him. There are Ecclesiasticall functions whereof the one hindereth the other, as seruing the tables, & preaching of the word, Act. 6.2. because of humane infirmities, which cannot attend diuerse things at once. But it shall neuer be found, that a thing which is holy and sacred to some men, is profane and abominable to others, and that the same which is a Sacrament to one man, is sacriledge and an abomination to another.

13 And to conclude, this error doth wrap and intangle it selfe so many wayes, that this pretended Sacrament is a Sacrament which men must diuine and presume of: in such manner that in the Church of Rome no man can assure himselfe

887. 7. 24. 11.

selfe that he is married, although he hath had a dozen children by his wife. For the Councell of Trent pronounceth excommunication and a curse against all those which shall say, that the intent of the Minister in conferring a Sacrament is not necessarie. It is a doctrine generally receiued in the Church of Rome, that if he which baptizeth, or marieth, or singeth Masse, hath not an intent to do that which the Church ordaineth, or hath not an intent to celebrate a Sacrament, Baptisme and Marriage solemnized by him are nothing, and neither Consecration nor Transubstantiation is made. Now this intent must be diuined or presumed vpon. Wherein, nevertheless there is matter and subiect enough to doubt, as for the Church of Rome is full of Priests which acknowledge and deride the abuses of the Church of Rome, & which condemne their owne actions: without speaking of Atheists whereof the world is full, who in their hearty laugh & mocke at all that which is done in the Church.

Dur. in Sent. l.

4. Dist. 26. q. 3.

14 For these causes or the like, *Durand* is of opinion, that to speake properly, Marriage is not a Sacrament. And which is more, *Pope Leo* the 1. in his 90. Epistle to *Rusticum* Bishop of Narbon saith: *Quod societas nuptiarum ab initio constituta est, et propter sacrum coniunctionem, habet in se Christi & Ecclesie Sacramentum*: That the societie of Marriage was established from the beginning, that besides the coniunction of sexes, it might be a Sacrament of Christ and his Church. This Bishop saith, that Marriage hath bene a Sacrament of Christ and the Church, *ab initio*, from the beginning, and not onely since the coming of Iesus Christ.

To be short, if we should say nothing the thing it selfe would speake: for Marriage hath bene made infamous and abominable to Priests for the preseruacion of Ecclesiasticall goods, lest they should take vpon them to withdraw some part thereof from the Church for the benefit of their children, as *Pope Gregorie* the 1. in the 28. Distinction in the Canon *De Symonismo*, saith: But where it was profitable for the Clergie to exalt Marriage, Popes haue found meanes to aduance it so farre as to make it a Sacrament, concerning iustifying

*Propter superstitiosum
& filij per
quos Ecclesia
fides potest per
re substantia.*

fyng grace, to draw the knowledge of matrimoniall causes to themselves.

Which appeareth by the dispensations and other practises whereby in this matter the Pope exalteth himselfe about God. For the Councell of Trent in the 24. Session pronounceth all those to be accursed, which say, that the Church cannot dispence with the degrees of consanguinitie prohibited by the word of God in Leviticus. And that men may know that in those dispensations the Pope is ruled by humane respects and worldly considerations, in the same Councell and the same Session, can. 5. prohibition is made, *ut in dispensatione non sit dispensatio, sed in dispensatione non sit dispensatio, sed in dispensatione non sit dispensatio* with the second degree, but onely betwene great Princes, and for publicke causes. If marriage in the second degree be permitted by the word of God, why doth the Pope prohibit it? If it be prohibited by the word of God, why doth the Pope dispence with Princes for the same? Have Princes the priuiledge to offend God?

The same cunning also appeareth herein, that the Pope hath inuented degrees of imaginarie kindreds betwene godfathers and godmothers, which may not marrie without dispensation, and by a great priuiledge. He hath extended the prohibition of marriage to the fourth degree of affinity, but he dispenceth therewith euen to the first degree of affinity, alway paying for it. The tax of the Romane Chancery imprinted at Paris with priuiledge and approbation, in the 40. lease hath these words. *The Penitentiary may dispence with the first degree of affinity at the barre of conscience, and the bill is sold for 9 duckats and sixe groates.* That is, that the Pope may giue permission to a man to marrie the sister of the wife deceased, against the expresse prohibition thereof made Levit. 18. 16. and 20. 21. Innocent the third did it, as Bellarmine acknowledged, in the 28. chapter of his booke of Marriage. The Almaine Doctor in the 12. chapter of his booke of Spirituall and temporall power hath these words, saying, *Martinus quinquiesimo consilio maturo habito, dispensauit inter aliquos in secundo gradu consanguinitatis qui est lege diuina prohibitus. Similiter temporibus nostris Papa dispensauit cum aliquo quod haberet duas sorores vnam post alteram contra legem Dei.*

Can. 3. Si quis
dixit
tum consan-
guinitatis &
affinitatis gra-
dus qui Leuiti-
cis exprimen-
tur, posse im-
pedire matri-
monium con-
trahendum &
dirimere con-
tractum, nec
posse Ecclesiā
in nonnullis il-
lorum dispen-
sare, aut con-
stituere ut
plures impedi-
ant & diri-
mant, Anno
thema sit.

* In secundo
gradu nunquā
dispensatur ni-
si inter magnos
Principes &
ob publicam
causam.
An. 1520. By
Toussains
Denis, rre S.
laques pres.
S. lues. Item
viam dispen-
sare potest pe-
nitentiaria in
primo gradu,
affinitatis in
foro conscien-
tia: & litera
vniu. duc. 9.
gr. 6.

* Martinus quinquiesimo consilio maturo habito, dispensauit inter aliquos in secundo gradu consanguinitatis qui est lege diuina prohibitus. Similiter temporibus nostris Papa dispensauit cum aliquo quod haberet duas sorores vnam post alteram contra legem Dei.

certain person in the second degree of consanguinitie, which is prohibited in the diuine Law. Likewise in our time the Pope gave a dispensation to a certain man to marrie two sisters one after the other, contrary to the Law of God, &c. Whereupon this Doctor produceth the authoritie of *Panormitanus* and *Angelus*, who maintaine that the Pope may dispence against the Law of God.

To make Marriage a Sacrament, our aduersaries produce *Ephesians* 5. 32. which in the vulgar translation is thus set downe, *The Sacrament is great, but I say in Iesus Christ and the Church*. But in the Greeke it is thus, *This is a great secret or a mystrie, but I speake concerning Christ, and concerning the Church*. In this place the Apostle speaketh of the sacred vnion betweene Iesus Christ and his Church: which vnion he compareth to corporall Marriage betweene the husband and the wife. His intent was not to exalt the mystrie of Marriage, but the vnion of the Church with Iesus Christ. This mystrie then whereof he speaketh, is the mysticall vnion betweene Iesus Christ and the Church, and not the vnion betweene the husband and the wife. For hauing said, *This is a great mystrie*, that we should not thinke that he speakes of the mystrie which is in Marriage, he addeth, *But I speake touching Iesus Christ and his Church*.

But be it so, that *Saint Paul* calleth Marriage a mystrie or secret: and that the vulgar translation hath truly translated *Mystrie* by the word *Sacrament*, what is that to prooue Marriage to be a Sacrament of the Church? Will our aduersaries haue all those things which in the vulgar translation are called Sacraments, to be Sacraments of the Church of Rome? By that reckoning the great whore shall be a Sacrament of the Romish Church: for in *Apocalyps* 17. 7. according to the vulgar translation, it is said, *I will shew thee the Sacrament of that woman, and of that beast that beareth her*. And the seuen starres in *Apocalyps* 1. 20. should be a Sacrament, for in the vulgar translation they are called so. And three times in *Dan.* 3. in the same translation dreames & visions are called Sacraments. And in 1. *Tim.* 3. 16. Pietie is called a great

Sacra-

Of extreme Vnction.

Extreme Vnction is a Sacrament of the Church of Rome, wherein the Priest annointeth the eyes, eares, nose, mouth, hands and feete of the sicke person with consecrated oyle, making the signe of the crosse with his thombe dipt in oyle, and beseecheth God to pardon the sicke person all the finnes which he committed by those parts of his body. Then he turneth the sicke person about, and annointeth his reines, because in them is the seate of the sinne of lecherie. That done, he washeth his hands with water and salt, and casteth the water into the chimney.

All this is done after the reading of the Litanie, wherein some hie Saints are named and called vpon, and with diuers prayers which craue of God health and remission of finnes for the sicke person.

This Sacrament is administred to none but to sicke persons which are in danger of death. It is not permitted to be administred to those that go to be hanged, or which go to place a petard vnder a gate, or which enter into a dangerous combat, or which go a long voyage by Sea.

*Quod si quis
Tridentina
capit. Extre-
ma vnctionis.*

The Catechisme of the Councell of Trent saith, that this Sacrament serueth to deface and blot out small and veniall finnes: for touching mortall finnes, penitentiall absolution hath defaced them before. The Councell of Trent in the 14. Session, saith, that by this Sacrament the rest of mens sins are cleansed.

To ground this pretended Sacrament they produce two places of the Scripture, the first is, Marke 6. 13. where it is said, *that the Apostles Cast out many diuels, and annointed many that were sicke with oyle, and healed them*: The second is, James 5. 14. 15. where it is said, *Is any sicke among you? let him call for the Elders of the Church, and let them pray for him, and annoint him with oyle in the name of the Lord: And the prayer of faith*

faith shall save the sick, and the Lord shall raise him up. If he hath committed sinnes, they shall be forgiven him.

In the exposition of some places our Adversaries are divided into contrary opinions, and their contention is great. Some of them, as *Thomas Waldensis*, *Alphonſus de Castro*, and *Maldonat* in his Commentarie vpon Saint *Marke*, are of opinion, that in the sixt of Saint *Marke* there is nothing spoken of extreme Vnction; and that both Saint *Marke* and Saint *Iames* speake of sacramentall Vnction.

Alphonſ. de Castro libr. de Harrefib. verbo Extrema Vnction.

Cardinall *Bellarmino* on the contrarie denieth that the Vnction spoken of in Saint *Marke* is the same that is spoken of in Saint *Iames*, and is not of opinion that that wherof Saint *Marke* speaketh, is the Sacrament of extreme Vnction.

Lib. de extrema Vnctione cap. 2.

Cardinall *Caietan* is of another opinion: for he formally denieth that Saint *Iames* speaketh of sacramentall Vnction, and beleeueth not that vpon that place extreme Vnction can be grounded, saying: *These words of S. Iames* speak not of the sacramentall Vnction of extreme vunction, whether we consider the words, or the effects thereof; but rather of the Vnction which the Lord Iesus ordained in the Gospell, to be vsed by his Disciples to the sick. For the Text saith not, *Is any sick to death?* but absolutely, *Is any sick?* and saith; that the effect of that Vnction is the easing of the sick person.

Nec ex verbis, nec ex effectibus verba haec loquuntur de sacramentali vunctione extrema vunctionis, sed magis de vunctione quam instituit Dominus Iesus in Evangelio à discipulis exercendam in aegrotos.

Among these mixtures of opinions, the Councell of Trent takes a new way, saying in the 14. Session, that in the sixt of Saint *Marke* Iesus Christ insinuateth the Sacrament of extreme Vnction. And the Catechisme of the Councell of Trent saith, that our Saviour giueth a pattern thereof, and a blessing or an entrance. It is the manner of this Councell when it findeth any thing against it, to vse ambiguous and wrested words, which euery man may interpret for his owne advantage.

Vide Sicuti Semensis Bib. luth. libr. 6. Annot. 339.

All this difference and contention may be drawne to these two heads.

The first is, whether this ceremony of anointing the sick ought to be perpetually in the Church.

The second, whether this Vnction practised in the time of the Apostles, is one of the Sacraments of the Christian Church.

First point.

The first question is cleared, because these two places, one the sixth of Saint *Mark*, the other, the fifth of Saint *Luke*, say, that this Vnction served for the healing of the sick. They appointed others like persons with oyle, and healed them, *Marke 6. Let them anoint the sick person with oyle in the name of the Lord, and the prayer of faith shall save the sick; and the Lord shall raise him up.* Whereby it appeareth, that while the gifts of healing, and this vertue of miraculous restoring of health, were in the Church, it was expedient to observe that Vnction as an exterior signe of the vertue of God, which unto God gaue efficacie. But since that vertue ceased, there is no more reason to observe that ceremony, then if a blind man should still use spectacles, or if one should use to combe himselfe when all his haire is fallen off and gone. Interior vertue ceasing, exterior observation ought to cease. God himselfe giueth each example thereof, in this, that he took the tree of life from *Adam*, when by sinne he fell into death. Not that life depended vpon that tree, but because God will not haue vnprofitable signes.

Hereby it appeareth, that Saint *Luke* speaketh not of extreme Vnction, seeing he speaketh of an Vnction whereby a man is restored to health. The Vnction is extreme which is given at the extremitie, but this Vnction is given to those which are to live still, and that being restored to health might in the same necessarie make use of the same remedy againe.

Adde hereunto, that Saint *Luke* speaketh not of oyle consecrated by a Bishop, nor of oyle kept in the Church; for the Apostles in that healing used such oyle indifferently as was at hand. Neither doth he speake of that heape of ceremonies used at this day in the Church of Rome. And as the Apostles anointed all those with oyle indifferently which were brought vnto them, Saint *Luke* also makes no distinction of persons. But the Church of Rome giueth extreme

Vnction.

Vnction to none but to those that are baptized, and which haue receiued the Sacraments of the Eucharist and of Penance, and which are not by iustice condemned to die.

4. The commandement then of Saint James ought yet at this day to be practised, touching the prayer of faith made by Priests or Ministers, to the which remission of sinnes is promised, but not touching corporall anointing, which was vsed for healing. So the Christians of the first ages vsed it. *Tertullian* against *Scapula*, chap. 4. saith, that the Emperour *Seuerus* ^a, untill he died kept *Praxidus* a Christian in his house, which had healed him of a disease by anointing him with oyle. And *Sulpicius* ^b in the life of *Martin*, saith, that *Martin* healed a maide of the palsey, by powring oyle into her mouth. We haue a like example in the Historie of *Gregory* of Tours, libi 1. cap. 46. *Cassander*, in the 23. Article of his Consultation, reciteth the forme of the ancient anointing of the sicke, which is worthy here to be set downe. *Letimes* past (saith he) the sicke person was annointed with oyle, which was called Oyle for sicke persons, or for lunaticke persons, or such as were possessed with euill spirits, in all their members, but specially in that member or place where his paine was, and then they added this forme of prayer: I annoint thee with sacred oyle, in the name of the Father, and of the Sonne, and of the holy Ghost; beseeching the mercy of God, our onely Lord and God, that all the paines and griefes of thy body being driven away, thou mayst reconer thy strength and thy health, in such manner, as thou being healed by the operation of this mystrie, and by the Vnction of this sacred oyle, and by our prayer, thou mayst receiue thy first and strongest health, by the power of our Lords Words which testifie, that the principall end of this vñction was the healing of the body. To the same end are the most part of the prayers which the Priest saith ouer the sicke, especially that wherein he prayeth, that the sicke person may be healed by that medicine.

5. That which Saint James addeth is nothing repugnant thereunto, when he saith, If he haue committed sinnes, they shall be forgiven him. For those words are as much in effect, as

a Senecus
Praculum
Christianus m,
qui Toparchis
cognominaba-
tur Eubodia
procuratorem,
qui cum per
oleum curare-
rat requisit.
b Agram in-
uens dari sibi
oleu postulat,
quod cum be-
nedixisset, in
os puella vira
sancti liquoris
infudit.
c Hic a sancto
Nepotiano vi-
sus et san-
ctus oleo per-
anctus reddi-
tur sanitati.
d Deus qui sa-
culo tuo Eze-
chia ter qui-
nos annos ad
vita donasti,
ita et hunc
sanctum tuu
ad lecto agri-
tudinis erigat
ad salutem.
Respice domi-
ne famulu tuu
um in infirmi-
tate corporis
labrantem,
et castigatio-
nibus tuis e-
mandatus con-
uino se senti-
at tua medici-
na sanatum.

if he had said, that healeth shall be restored unto him, *those finnes for the which God hath afflicted him being pardoned.* Iesus Christ himselfe teacheth vs that, *Matth. 9. 5.* where he saith, that to say vnto the sicke person, *Thy finnes are forgiven thee;* and to say, *Take up thy bed and walke,* are all one in effect. For, the cause of the euill being taken away, by necessity the euill ceaseth. Saint James therefore in that place followeth the words of his Maister. Besides, he attributeth not the remission of finnes to the vertue of the oyle, but to prayer made in faith, saying, *The prayer of faith shall save the sicke, and the Lord shall raise him up; if he hath committed finnes, they shall be forgiven him.*

6 Thereupon our aduersaries aske vs, why S. James in that place speaketh of sicke persons, and not of deafe and blind men. Not this is not to dispute against vs, but to demand of Saint James a reason of his speech. It may be that the Apostle by one kind of corporall infirmity did also vnderstand others: & it may also be, that Vnction was vsed to none but to those that lay sicke in their beds, and that they vsed not that kind of remedy for deafe, blind and impotent persons, as we may see of the lame person spoken of, *Acts 3. 2.*

It is to no purpose to object, that many also besides Priests had the gift of healing; and that therefore it was not needfull to call them to performe this anointing to heale the sicke. For then God more commonly conferred those gifts vpon Pastors, and in a greater measure then vpon others, to authorize their preaching.

It is also to no purpose to say, that if as often as Priests anointed the sicke they were healed, no man would haue died in those times: for many had no desire to call them, and many had not the meanes nor the leisure. And Saint James did not promise that they should heale all without exception. For in the ninth of Saint Marke, the Apostles could not heale a man possit with a diuell. And it is not vnlikely, but that when God reuealed to an Apostle that the time of the sicke parties death approached, the same Apostle abstained from vsing of that remedie which he knew would not preuaile.

Now

Now for the second point, which is to know whether the Vnction which the Apostles and their Disciples vsed, may be called a Sacrament.

The second point. Whether extreme Vnction be a Sacrament.

Touching that I say, If we take the word Sacrament in the same sence which the ancient Fathers and Romish Bible ordinarily take it, that is, for a mysteric, or for a sacred signe, nothing hindereth but that we may call this Vnction a Sacrament, seeing it was a sacred signe of the grace and assistance of God.

But this Vnction cannot be called a Sacrament in the same sence that Baptisme and the Lords Supper are called Sacraments, that is, sacred signes and seales of the Couenant made by God in Iesus Christ, instituted by Iesus Christ himselfe; I say that in this sence the Vnction whereof Saint James speaketh cannot be called a Sacrament.

1 For Sacraments taken in this sence, are instituted for the health of the soule, but that Vnction specially and principally serued for the health of the body.

2 Not onely the practise of Sacraments (as of Baptisme and of the Lords Supper) but also the institution of them by Iesus Christ are found in the Gospell. But none of the Euangelists do recite the institution of this Sacrament, neither where, when, nor how Iesus Christ did institute it. Onely we see a practise of this Vnction by healing of the sicke, which of a miraculous medicine is changed into an ordinary Sacrament, laden with a thousand ceremonies after the custome and manner of superstition, which is, to multiply ceremonies after the vertue is lost. I do not deny that this Vnction was commanded by Iesus Christ: for it is not credible that the Apostles did any thing without his commandement. But euery thing which Iesus Christ commanded his Apostles to do, is not a Sacrament. He commanded his Apostles to do many things which were personall to themselves, and which ought not to be perpetuall: as when he commanded them to go and preach the Gospell, without mony, and without provision for themselves. And if this Vnction were a perpetuall Sacrament, the Euangelists would carefully haue recited the in-

stitution.

stitution; and the commandment for the perpetual observing thereof in the Church.

3 The Sacraments of the Christian Church ought to be administered in the Church: but this extreme Vnction is neuer administered but in particular mens houses.

4 The fruit & vse of this extreme Vnction witheth such that it is no Sacrament. For the Council of Trent in the 7 Session in the 6. and 7. Canon, saith, That Sacraments containe the grace which they conferre, and that they conferre the same to those which duly receiue them. Therefore the sacramental words of other Sacraments are concluded at the present time when they are conferred, as in Confirmation, *Signa te sig- no crucis, & confirma te Chrysma salutis*, I marke thee with the signe of the crosse, and confirme thee with the Chrysme of saluation. And in Baptisme, *I baptise thee in the name of the Father, &c.* and so in all the rest. There is none but this Sacrament onely, which doth not conferre grace, but onely maketh a request: which saith not, *I heale thee, or I absolve thee*, but onely asketh health and remission of finnes. Then if it be a Sacrament, it must be an operative Sacrament, and not a Sacrament conferring the grace of God; an irregular Sacrament, which by his signes doth not represent graces but desires. For our aduersaries might well perceiue, that if they had said *I heale thee*, they had bene confuted by experience, because very few sicke persons escaped death after extreme Vnction, which was carried to none but to those that were at the point of death, as if that Sacrament serued onely to end life, and not to prolong it. They might also consider, that if they say, *I forgive thee thy sin*, this Sacrament should vsurpe vpon the Sacrament of Penance.

5 In the meane time by this manner of operative speaking, they imprint a scruple in mens minds: for seeing that of two things which the Priest requireth of God, that is, healing of the sicke person, and remission of sins, it appeareth that God doth not heare him in the one: how then shall we be assured that God heareth him in the other? seeing that the place of Saint James, whereupon they partly ground this Sacrament, equally

equally promiset health and remission of finnes?

6 Lastly, seeing that before this Sacrament the sicke person hath receiued absolution by the which all his finnes are remitted, what finnes are they which still remaine to be remitted by this extreme Vnction? If by the Sacrament of Penance mortall finnes are remitted, why should not the same Sacrament remit small and veniall finnes? Why should not that which effecteth the greater effect the lesser? Thereby it manifestly appeareth, that this Sacrament is vnprofitable, and is like a plaister laid vpon a wound that is whole, and which serueth to aske remission of finnes, which are said to be pardoned before.

7 Now that this Sacrament is new and vnknewen in the ancient Church, it appeareth by this, that there is no trace or signe thereof in all Antiquitie. For the Canons of the Councell of Nice translated out of the Arabian tongue, are an inuention of *Turrian* the Iesuite: to who if any credit may be given none before him ever knew what the Canons of that so famous a Councell were. *Iuarez* the first which wrote in anno 407. or 408. speaketh of this vnction, but calls it not a Sacrament. And every man knowes how much all those Decretals are suspected of falsehood, and to be of small authoritie. *Belarmin* setteth downe a place of *Chrysostome* in the 2. booke of Priests, but such as placeth nor this Vnction among the Sacraments. The places of Saint *Augustine* which he produceth are drawne out of the Sermons *De tempore*, and out of the booke of the Glasse and out of the booke of the Visitation of the sicke, which are suspected bookes. The oldest witness that speaketh is the eleventh Councell of Chalons vpon Soame, holden 800. yeares after the birth of Iesus Christ; and yet was but a particular Synode. Notwithstanding which Councell, the Canonist Doctors which haue written Glosses vpon the Decretals, are of opinion that extreme Vnction is not a Sacrament. *What letteth* (say they) *that it should be reputed, seeing it is no Sacrament?*

Tit. 21. De
secundis imp.
191, cap. Vir
autē. In Glos-
sa. Quid enim
impediret
hanc iterari
cum nō sit Sa-
cramentum?

of

Of the Sacrament of Orders.

p. 208.

The conferring of sacred Orders in the Romish Church is called a Sacrament. Those orders are seven, viz. Porters, Readers, Exorcists or Coniurers, Acolyths or such as minister to the Priest at Masse, Subdeacons, Deacons, and Priests, under the which Bishops are contained: for the Church of Rome doth not make two orders of Priests and Bishops.

Our adversaries do not say that Iesus Christ did institute these seven Orders aforesaid: and no Sacrament is of force which was not instituted by Iesus Christ. Onely they say, that Iesus Christ did execute and exercise these seven Orders, and supplied the functions. They say that he did the office of a porter when he said, *I am the door of the sheepe*, Ioh. 10. 7. That he did the office of a Reader, when he tooke the booke of the prophesie of Esay, and read it in the Synagogue, Luke 4. 16, 17. That he did the office of an Exorcist, when he draue out wicked spirits. Pope Innocent 3. in his first booke of the mysteries of the Masse, cap. 3. saith, that Iesus Christ did the office of an Acolyth (or a server of the Priest at Masse) when he said (*I am the light of the world*:) for that office was to beare waxe candles. And in the fourth chap. he saith, that Iesus Christ did the office of a Subdeacon, when he washed his disciples feet. And in the fift chapter he saith, that Iesus Christ did the office of a Deacon, when he distributed the Sacrament, and when he waked the disciples when they slept, Luk. 22. 26, 28. Lastly all of them say, That Iesus Christ did the office of a Priest, when he sacrificed his body in the Eucharist vnder the signe of bread. But which of these seven offices did he, when he preached the Gospell? This is a point wherewith these subtile Doctors do not trouble themselves: and in truth it is not a necessarie thing, for a man may be a Priest among them without being a preacher. There rested nothing but to make Iesus Christ an Abbot, or a Cardinall, or a Pope; for the Scrip-
ture

cure would have furnished these Doctors with places which they might wrest to their purpose with the like dexterity.

Every one of these orders are conferred by words and ceremonies cleane differing one from the other. Whereupon it followeth, that each Order is a Sacrament apart, and that it is an abuse by them committed to reckon but seven Sacraments in the Church of Rome, when there are thirteene.

To examine each of these Orders, were as much as to picke strawes, and to shew diligence where there is no need. The Order of Priests only deserueth and requireth some discourse, for that vpon the puritie and lawfull exercise of Priesthood, the integritie of all other Orders, and the puritie of all religion dependeth.

whether the order of Priesthood be a Sacrament.

The office of the Priest, or Minister, or Pastor of the Church, 10. *385.* is conferred by imposition of the hands of those which conferre that Order, and which establish a Pastor in his office. This imposition of hands was vsed in the old Testament, as you may see Numbers 27. and 34. of Deut. where by Gods commandement *Moses* laid his hand vpon *Iosua* to establish him in his office. This custome was practised by the Apostles when they established Pastors. The Apostle Saint *Paul* saith to his disciple *Timothie*, 1. Tim. 4. 14. *Despise not the gift that is in thee, which was giuen thee by prophesie, and the laying on of the hands of the company of the Eldership.* And in the 5. and 22. *Lay hands suddenly on no man.*

The question betweene vs is, whether this Ordination may be called a Sacrament. I answer, that if the word Sacrament be taken simply for a sacred signe or for a mysterie, which is the sence wherein this word is ordinarily taken among the Latine Fathers, and in the translation of the Romish Church, we easily admit this imposition of hands to be called a Sacrament, because it is a visible signe of an inuisible grace, v-
sed by the Apostles.

But

But to be called a Sacrament in the same sence that Baptisme and the holy Supper are called, there are many things that hinder it. For this imposition of hands, is not a sacred signe of the covenant of God in Iesus Christ, and is not common to all the faithfull: neither is the expresse institution thereof found in the historie of the Gospell. For Iesus Christ did not establish his Apostles in their offices by laying his hands on them, but by breathing on them, and saying vnto them, *Receive the holy Ghost, whose sinnes soener you remit, they shall be remitted, &c.*

Particularly the Church of Rome hath reason not to place sacred Orders among the Sacraments: for by prohibiting Marriage of Priests, and calling a Priests Marriage sacriledge, it maketh the Sacraments fight together, and causeth one to exclude the other, and to become sacriledge.

But this disputation, whether the ordaining of Priests may be called a Sacrament, is not the principall difference betweene vs; and we could be content to call it a Sacrament, so Priesthood did not change the nature, & that the functions thereof were ruled and limited by the word of God. But the corruption therein is so great, that Priesthood at this day is not the ministry of the Gospell. For of preachers of the Gospell and Ministers of the Sacraments, Priests are become sacrificers of the body of Christ, which they maintaine to be a roall and propitiatorie sacrifice. Their office is to make Iesus Christ with words, to sacrifice him to his Father. By the same corruption the Bishopricke among them is become an earthly principality, and a dignity of a Prince of the Popes Monarchie. This requireth a Chapter apart.

Of the order of Priesthood in the Church of Rome, and of their sacrificing.

11. 6. 11.

In the Scripture the office of Priests is to labour in the word, 1. Tim. 5. 17. and to feede the flocke of the Lord, Acts 10. 17. In the

the 2. chapter of the Acts, the office of Pastors is to continue in the Apostles doctrine and fellowship, and breaking of bread, and prayer.

At this day the office and duty of a Priest consisteth not in preaching the Gospel for in the Church of Rome the greatest part of the Priests preach not. To be a Preacher, they must haue another dignitie besides Priesthood. By the manner of their ordinatio they are made sacrificers of the body of Iesus Christ.

The Bishop putteth the cower and the chalice into their hands, saying, *Receive power to offer sacrifice to God, and to celebrate Masses as well for the liuing as for the dead.*

Accipe potestatem offerre sacrificium Deo, Missasq; celebrare, tam pro viuis quā pro mortuis.

By these words the Bishop conferreth a charge which Iesus Christ did not institute, yea and such a charge as surpasseth all the dignity and power of Angels, whose vertue and excellency is nothing in regard of making Iesus Christ, and of offering him to God for a sacrifice: which deserued a formall commandement and an expresse institution of Iesus Christ. But there is no such thing found in the Scripture.

1 For the Apostle, Ephesians 4. 11. and 1. Cor. 12. 28. nominateth the offices which Iesus Christ established in his Church. *He him selfe* (saith he) *gaue some to be Apostles, and some Prophets, and some Euangelists, and some Pastors and Teachers.* There is no mention neither there nor elsewhere made of the sacrifice of the body of our Lord.

2 And further in the same place, their functions which God would haue them to exercise, are particularly declared: which are, *for the repairing of the Saints, for the works of the ministerie, and for the edification of the body of Christ.* But not to sacrifice the body of Christ.

3 And it is not without cause, that oftentimes in the new Testament all the faithfull are called Priests: but there is no place in the Scripture to be found where Pastors of the Church are expressely called sacrificers. The holy Ghost foreseeing that there would some Pastors arise that would take that title vpon them in an iniurious sence against the Sonne of God.

4 For, not to speake of the iniurie done to the sacrifice of the

the crosse, whereof I will speake hereafter: I say, that by this office of a sacrificer of the body of Iesus Christ, the Priest exalteth himselfe above Iesus Christ. For it is manifest, that to sacrifice is a more excellent thing then to be sacrificed: as *Aaron* was more excellent then his offerings or the things that he offered; for *Aaron* represented Iesus Christ sacrificing, as the thing offered represented Iesus Christ which was to be offered. The dignity of the sacrificing priest makes the offering acceptable. The Priest therefore sacrificing Iesus Christ, exalteth himselfe above Iesus Christ, because the Priest is the Sacrificer, and Iesus Christ is the Sacrifice. For although that in the Masse they pretend that Iesus Christ is also the sacrificer, yet this is certaine, that the Priest sacrificing Iesus Christ in the Masse, is more excellent then Iesus Christ, in as much as he is there sacrificed. For when we shall have examined and considered all the actions whereby the Priest pretendeth to accomplish his sacrifice, as the pronounciation of the consecrating words, the eleuation of the Host, the prayers which beseech God to accept of the offering, the breaking and the eating, we shall find that the Priest doth all these things, and that they cannot be attributed to Iesus Christ. From whence it followeth, that in the sacrifice of the Masse, Iesus Christ is not the sacrificer.

5 It also appeareth that in the Masse the Priest exalteth himselfe above Iesus Christ, in this, that he hath the Host in his power, he breaketh it when he will, he carrieth it whither he will, and when it pleaseth him to throw it into the fire, or tread it vnder his feet, he may do it. For that Iesus Christ which he pretendeth to sacrifice, is without sense and motion, and cannot defend himselfe. He cannot breathe, nor open his eyes, nor stirre his hands. And although the Priest were a murderer, an incestuous person, or a Sodomite, yet (according to the opinion of the Romish Church,) he hath Iesus Christ in his power.

6 If we aske our aduersaries, wherein the Priesthood of the new Testament, and that perpetuall Priesthood according to the order of *Malchisedech* consisteth: they answer,

swer, that it consisteth herein, That euery day the Priest sacrificeth the body of our Lord vnder the accidents of bread and wine in the Eucharist. How comes it to passe then, that the Epistle to the Hebrewes, which is one of the longest, and which (in a manner) speaketh of no other thing then of the continual Priesthood of the new Testament, and of the Priesthood of *Melchisedech*, speaketh nothing of the Eucharist, nor of the sacrifice of bread and wine, nor of any earthly sacrificer? but speaketh of no other sacrificer then Iesus Christ, nor of any other Sacrifice then of his death? How did he forget that wherein at this day they make the Priesthood of the Christian Church onely to consist? The Apostle by this reckoning, doth like one that writing of the dutie of a King, speaketh neither of his kingdome, nor of his subiects: or, as if one should write of the art of Horsemanship, without speaking of horses. For the Apostle hath at large written of the continuall Priesthood of the Christian Church, without speaking of the sacrifice of the Eucharist, wherein they will haue this Priesthood onely to consist.

7 Further, if we aske our aduersaries, when this Sacrament of the order of Priesthood was instituted, they answer, that Iesus Christ did institute it when he celebrated the Eucharist among his Apostles, and say, that then they receined the order of Priesthood. But in that action, where was there any conferring of that Order? Where was the imposition of hands, or any other ceremony which supplied that want? Where was there any instructions touching the office of a Priest? seeing that priesthood (according to themselves) hath many other functions, besides sacrificing of the body of our Lord?

8 But who will beleene, that Iesus Christ celebrating the holy Supper, did institute two Sacraments by one action? Two different or seuerall Sacraments should necessarily be instituted by different words and seuerall ceremonies. We cannot by the same words and actions administer Baptisme and Marriage; or conferre Confirmation and extreme Vnction.

9 If the Apostles were made Sacrificers when Iesus Christ said vnto them; *Do this in remembrance of me*: it followeth, that they might sing Masse (as at this day they say) while Iesus Christ was vpon the Crosse or in the Sepulcher: which necessarily at one time maketh one Iesus Christ suffering vpon the Crosse, and another Iesus Christ not suffering in the Host: one dead in the Sepulcher, and another liuing in the Masse, both at one time.

10 From hence also it would follow, that the Apostles were for a while Priests without keyes, and could sing Masse without giuing absolution: for the power to remit sinnes promised vnto them in the 18. of Saint Matthew, was not actually conferred vnto them but in Iohn 20. 23. certaine dayes after the resurrection of the Lord.

11 Let the Reader that hath any care of his saluation, earnestly consider that which I shall say: which is, that Saint *Matthew* and *S. Marke*, reciting how and in what manner Iesus Christ instituted and celebrated the Eucharist among his Disciples, haue set downe these words, *Do this*, and adde no more. Then if by these words, *Do this*, the Lord did establish Sacrificers of his body, and instituted the sacrificing Priesthood of the new Testament, as the Councell of Trent saith: and if by those words Iesus Christ instituted a Sacrament, we must say, that those two Pen-men of the holy Ghost, whereof the one, that is, Saint *Matthew*, was present at the action, haue made a rehearfall vnto vs of this institution which is defective in the principall point, and haue omitted the institution of this Sacrifice so important, and of this office of Sacrificer of the new Testament. If they had done as *S. Iohn* doth, who speaketh not at all of the Institution of the Supper, it might be thought to be lesse strange that *S. Matthew* and *S. Marke* had omitted both the institution of the holy Supper, and of the office of Sacrificer. But by reciting the institution of the holy Supper, and omitting those formal words, whereby they saw he instituted an office of a Sacrificer and a Sacrifice, it is manifest and most euident, that they were ignorant of that office of Sacrificer, and of that i-

maginarie

maginarie sacrifice.

12 I would likewise haue them shew me, who conferred the office of Sacrificer to Saint *Paul* the Apostle, and who gaue him authoritie to sacrifice the body of Iesus Christ: for he was not at the Table with the Apostles when the Lord said vnto them, *Do this in remembrance of me*. In the Acts of the Apostles we see how Iesus Christ called him, and how he established him in his office of Apostle, in which office he saith, he was not established by any man, but by Iesus Christ. And the office whereunto Iesus Christ called him, was not to be a Sacrificer of his bodie, but to be an instrument to beare his name before the Gentiles, and Kings, and the children of Israel, Acts 9. 15. Behold here then an Apostle without the office of a Sacrificer, to whom Iesus Christ neuer said, *Sacrifice me in remembrance of me*.

13 And seeing that our Aduersaries are of opinion that Iesus Christ celebrated Masse in Emaus with two of his Disciples, whereof we reade in Luke 24. I aske then, If in that action he made those two Disciples Sacrificers of his bodie? If by saying vnto them, *Do this*, he did not make them Sacrificers, it followeth, that these words, *Do this*, do not signifie, *Sacrifice me*. But if by these words he made them Sacrificers, it will follow that there were Sacrificers which had not their vocation from Saint *Peter*.

14 The Apostle *S. Paul*, 1. Cor. 11. 14. rehearseth the institution of this holy Sacrament, that the Corinthians might be confirmed therein. There he witnesseth, that Iesus Christ saying, *Do this in remembrance of me*, spake to all the faithfull: for those to whom he directed those words, are they, who in the verse ensuing, he commandeth to declare the death of the Lord, and to eate of that Bread and drinke of that Cup after they haue examined themselves: which is a commandement made to the people, and which euery faithfull Christian ought to do. By this meanes euery Christian shall be a Sacrificer, and may sing Masse.

15 If these words, *Do this in remembrance of me*, were words that ordained the office of Sacrificers, euery time, and as often

as we should exhort the faithfull in that holy action, to do that in remembrance of Iesus Christ which Iesus Christ did, we should establish as many sacrificers as there are communicants.

16 The Apostle to the Hebrewes speaketh absolutely against this Priesthood invented by men; for besides that which he saith in the 5. Chapter 4. verse, that *No man taketh this honour unto himselfe, but he that is called of God, as Aaron was,* in the 7. Chapter, verse 23. 27. he giueth two peremptorie reasons, for the which the sacrifice & the Priesthood of the law ought to be abolished. The one is, that the soueraigne sacrificers of the Law were subiect to die, and that death hindered them from continuing. The other is, that they were bound to sacrifice first for their owne finnes, and then for the peoples finnes; which also was proper to inferior sacrificers, who also being mortall and sinners, died and were taken away. What is there in all this that equally concerns not the sacrificers of the Church of Rome, who are likewise mortall and sinfull? And what excuse may be given, why they should continue and be suffered in the Church, which may not serue as well for the continuance and maintenance of the Priests of the Law? Was the Apostle so voide of sense, as not to see and perceiue, that speaking in that manner against the legall Priesthood, he also spake against the Priesthood vnder the Gospell? Would he not (thinke you) haue taken away this scruple, and prevented this obiection?

17 To be short, the Bishops of the Church of Rome are continuing there still, and yet could neuer shew their power, nor their commission from Iesus Christ to establish sacrificers of his body in the Church.

Of the sacrifice of the Masse.

22. Sect.

The Councell of Trent in 22. Session and 2. Canon, thundereth out excommunications and curses against all those that
say

say that our Lord Iesus Christ by these words, *Do this in remembrance of me*, did not conferre the order of Priesthood to his Apostles, nor commanded them to sacrifice his bodie and his blood.

The ordinarie exposition which they make of these words, *Do this in remembrance of me*, is, Sacrifice my bodie and my blood really vnder the kinds of bread and wine, as a propitiatorie sacrifice for the living and the dead. To expound the Scripture in this manner, is not so much to wrest it, as to play therewith. These Doctores contrary to all apparence of truth, will haue that to be Iesus Christs meaning, which the words of our Lord can by no meanes beare.

1 For we cannot sacrifice Iesus Christ in remembrance of Iesus Christ. The memorials of things are of other nature then the things themselves: as mens pictures are not the persons themselves. And there is nothing more absurd nor extravagant then the affirmation of these Doctores, which hold, that in the Masse Iesus Christ is the figure of himselfe, and the signe, and the thing signified, as if a man should say that the Kings picture is the King, or that the King is his picture.

2 Adde hereunto, that remembrance is necessarily understood of things absent. Men may well make rehearsals or remembrances of the valors of a King in his owne presence; but those rehearsals or remembrances are not remembrances of the Kings person being present, but of his actions past. So the sepulchers of Martyrs were called the memories of Martyrs, because they put men in minde of their sufferings past. It cannot be said but very improperly, that the person of a Martyr is in his tombe, when the best part thereof is in heauen, and that which resteth is consumed to dust. The ashes of a Martyr are not the person of a Martyr.

3 These words, *Do this*, are so clearely and manifestly expounded by the Apostle Saint Paul, that there is no contradiction to be made. For 1. Cor. 11. 25. 26. after he had said, *Do this in remembrance of me*, for an exposition of these words he addeth, saying, *For as often as you shall eat this bread, and drinke this cup, you shew the Lords death till he come. To do*

*Bellar. l. 2. de
Euchar. c. 24.
Idem Christus
suis figura sui
ipsum. Et h.
Tertia. Est ve-
re corpus Do-
mini, & signu
eiusdem cor-
poris.*

this then in remembrance of Iesus Christ, is to eat the bread, and to drinke the cup, to shew and celebrate his death, and not to sacrifice it.

4. Moreover in all the action of this Sacrament, we see no shew nor apparence of a sacrifice. First, Iesus Christ speaketh not of a sacrifice nor of an offering. Secondly, Iesus Christ presenteth nothing vnto God, but to his disciples, laying, *Take, eat.* Now whosoever offereth a sacrifice to God, presenteth something vnto him, and prayeth God to accept of his offering. Thirdly, Iesus Christ did not lift vp the host, which is a common custome and vse in all sacrifices. Fourthly, the Apostles did not adore the host, but sate still at the table without vring any adoration. For although they had Iesus Christ ordinarily present with them, yet they did neuer eat him, nor euer were present at any such kind of sacrifice. And if euerie sacrifice requireth adoration, how much more then such and so admirable a sacrifice? specially in an action which should serue for a patterne and an example in the Church, to conformance men thereunto in time to come? And if any one (when the host is lifted vp) to conformance himselfe to the example of the Apostles, should sit still without adoring it, should he not be thought and esteemed to be a prophane person? And if he were in Spaine or Italie, should he not be sent to the Inquisition? And yet in the person of such a man they should make a processe against the Apostles.

5. It is to be considered, that if the bodie of Iesus Christ be really sacrificed in the Masse, it is conuenient and very necessarie, that the bread should be consecrated before they sacrifice it. And therein we agree with our aduersaries. Which being granted, I reason thus: Whosoever offereth an oblation vnto God, necessarily speaketh vnto God. But in this action, after the words which they say are consecrating words, Iesus Christ speaketh not to God; *Ergo*, in this action after the consecrating words, Iesus Christ offereth no oblation to God. The action of thanksgiuing and the blessing of the bread went before the words that are called consecrating words; therefore they can be no part of the sacrifice. For

that to blesse bread, and to give thanks to God, is not to sacrifice it to God. This blessing is vsed at all meale times; and Iesus Christ did it at the distribution by him made of the loaves of bread in the desert.

Math. 14. 19.
Luk. 9. 16.

6 It is to be noted that the Councell of Trent saith, that this sacrifice is truly propitiatory, and that in the Canon of the Masse the Priest saith, that he offereth a sacrifice for the redemption of soules. If the Masse be a sacrifice of redemption, necessarily it must be called so, either because the death of Iesus Christ is applyed vnto vs thereby, or because Iesus Christ dieth in the Masse, and suffereth there for our redemption. But it is not because Iesus Christ dieth in the Masse; for Rom. 6. 9. *Iesus Christ being raised from the dead, dieth no more.* Then the Masse must be propitiatory, and a sacrifice of redemption, because in it the death of Iesus Christ is applyed vnto vs, which onely is the price of our redemption. But if y be so, Baptisme and the preaching of the Gospell, and faith in Iesus Christ, are also sacrifices of redemption, and sacrifices truly propitiatory. Adde hereunto, that to apply the sacrifice of the Crosse vnto vs, which is the death of our Lord, it is neither conuenient, nor possible to sacrifice the Lord againe. For as to apply a plaister, or to make a payment of money, we need not another plaister, nor another payment: so to apply the reall sacrifice of the body of Christ vnto vs, we must not really sacrifice the body of Christ. By that reason, to apply the death of Iesus Christ vnto vs, we must make Christ die againe. And in so important a thing, we must ground vpon the word of God, and shew that God will haue vs to apply the death of our Lord vnto our selues by sacrificing him really in the Eucharist.

*Hoc sacrificiū
laudis pro redemp-
tione animarum,*

7 There is nothing more absurd, then to apply vnto our selues a rancome prayd for vs, by paying it againe. Yet this is done in the Romish Church, which will haue the faithfull to apply vnto themselves the redemption of their soules made for them on the crosse, by offering the same redemption againe, and by sacrificing Iesus Christ againe in a sacrifice of redemption.

8 Moreover, that which our aduersaries do is cleane contrary to that which they pretend to do: for to offer Iesus Christ to God, is not an application and an appropriating of him vnto our selues. There is as much difference betweene these two things, as there is betweene giuing a thing to another, and keeping it for our selues. In the holy Supper we apply the sacrifice of Iesus Christ vnto our selues, by receiuing and accepting it by faith, as giuing himselfe vnto vs, and not by offering himselfe in a sacrifice to God.

9 I would haue our aduersaries tell me, whether the redemption or propitiation which the Priest offereth and maketh to God in the Masse, be all one with the propitiation which Iesus Christ offered and made on the crosse, or another. If it be the same, necessarily the Priest must offer a reall sacrifice of the death of Iesus Christ, which is impossible; for Iesus Christ dieth not really in the Masse. If it be another redemption and propitiation, then there is two prices of redemption, and another propitiation for our soules besides the death of Iesus Christ, and vnder shadow of applying vnto vs the redemption made on the crosse, they substitute another redemption, and so forge another Gospell.

10 The Apostle to the Hebrewes is excellent in this matter. He speaketh much of the Priesthood of *Melchisedech* without speaking of the Eucharist: whereby it followeth, that the Eucharist is not the sacrifice of *Melchisedech*.

11 Besides in Hebr. 10. 14. it is said, That Iesus Christ *with one offering hath reconciled for ever them that are sanctified*. Here is one onely oblation or offering, and the vertue thereof for ever. And to exclude the veneration thereof, in the tenth verse he saith, *That we are sanctified once by the offering of Iesus Christ once made*.

12 They answer and say, that he offered himselfe but once in a bloody sacrifice, but that he is offered diuerse times in a sacrifice that is not bloody. Which is a manifest error; for, to offer himselfe diuers times in a sacrifice without blood, is alwayes to offer himselfe diuers times, and so to contradict the

the Apostle. Adde hereunto, that the bloody sacrifice is found in the Scripture, but there is no mention made of the sacrifice of Iesus Christ without blood. To dallie with the Scripture by distinctions vnwritten, is vnder pretence of interpreting, to correct the Scripture. And our aduersaries having rackt the words of the institution of the holy Supper, finde nothing therein but their owne condemnation. For, to alledge the words of Iesus Christ, saying, *This cup is the new Testament in my blood, which is shed for you*, to prooue a sacrifice without blood, is to condemne themselves; because those words speake of effusion of blood; and not of a sacrifice without blood. To proue a place wherein there is no blood shed, by a place that speaketh of shedding of blood, is as good an argument, as if to excuse theft a man should alledge the law which saith, *Thou shalt not steale*.

13 Therefore the Apostle preuenteth this excuse for Hebr. 9. 25. 26. after he had said that Iesus Christ *did not offer himselfe oftentimes*, he addeth, *That then he must haue suffered oftentimes*, manifestly shewing, that he acknowledged no other sacrifice of Iesus Christ but his passion. And to cut off all difficulty, he addeth, verse 27. 28. *And as it is appointed vnto men that they should once die, and after that cometh the iudgement: So Christ was once offered to take away the sinnes of many, and vnto them that looke for him, shall he appeare the second time without sinne, vnto saluation*. Now where is the distinction of a bloody and no bloody sacrifice? seeing that the Apostle sheweth, that as a man can die but once, so Christ offered himselfe but once? How ridiculous a thing should it be, for one to say, that a man can die but once bloudily, but diuerse times vnbloudily?

14 The same Apostle, in the same chapter and the 22. verse, after he had spoken of the sacrifices, and purifications of the Law, concludeth by this generall maxime, *That without shedding of blood there is no remission of sinnes*. If then the Masse be no bloody sacrifice, there is no remission of sinnes made by it. And you must note that he speaketh of the present time, saying, *There is no remission of sinnes: lest men should thinke that*:

that he spake onely of the Iudaicall sacrifices that were abolished. The Apostle will haue this rule to be certaine, euen at this present time. Note also, that the Apostle saith not, that there is no remission of sinnes but by the verue of blood: but he saith, that in sacrifices there is no remission of sinnes without effusion of blood. It is nothing to the purpose to seeke in the old Testament for examples of propitiatory sacrifices wherein no blood was shed: as the goate of *Azael*, or the Scape-goate, which was sent away aliue into the desert laden with the sinnes of the people, *Leuit. 16. 20.* That is not to dispute against vs, but against the Apostle. And yet that goate was but a part of the sacrifice: there being two goates, wherof the one was killed, the other let go, and both of them were but one sacrifice. As in the sacrifice of two sparowes, wherof one was killed, the other letteth away; one to represent the death of our Lord, the other to be a figure of his resurrection, which two things could not be represented by one creature. If our aduersaries find reasons to proue y^e propitiatory sacrifices without shedding of blood ought to be practised vnder the new Testament, the same reasons of like force are to be found vnder the old Testament: where neuerthelesse they were not suffered.

Leuit. 14.

¶ He that is carefull of his owne saluation, will consider what kind of religion that is which maketh two sacrifices of redemption, wherein Iesus Christ is really sacrificed. Two sacrifices of Iesus Christ differing in *specie* and in definition, in propriety, in accidents, and in efficacie. For the sacrifice of the crosse is the death of Iesus Christ, but the sacrifice of the Masse is not the death of Iesus Christ. The one is a painfull sacrifice, the other without paine. The one bloody, the other without blood. The one wherein the body of Iesus Christ is broken, the other wherein it remaineth whole. The one visible, the other invisible. The one done but once, the other which is done a thousand millions of times. The one done immediately by Iesus Christ, the other by the hand of a Priest. The one which being once offered was sufficient for the redemption of all mankind; the other, which is repeated a thousand times

times to draw one soule out of Purgatory. The one which is done freely, the other which is sold for money. The one offered for the remission of finnes and for the saluation of mens soules, the other which is offered for a sicke horse, for corne that is blasted, for the successe of a voyage, and to be short, which serueth for all things except the saluation of soules. White is not more contrarie vnto blacke, nor heauen more distant from the earth, then there is difference betweene these two sacrifices.

¶ 16 This pretended sacrifice without effusion of blood, is contrary to the nature of all sacrifices properly so called. For both we and our aduersaries say, that in every sacrifice properly called a sacrifice, the thing that is offered must be visible, and that visible thing must be destroyed by the sacrifice. In this it is cleane contrarie. For in this sacrifice Iesus Christ which is the thing sacrificed is not seene nor perceiued; and he is so farre off from being visible vnder the *species* or accidents of bread, that on the contrary it is the accidents that hide him & make him inuisible, if we beleene our aduersaries. Also that which is destroyed in the Masse, is not the thing which is offered vnto God. The body of Iesus which they pretend to sacrifice, suffereth no destruction in the Masse. For the destruction of a liuing thing is nothing else but death: the accidents onely are destroyed, which are not offered vnto God. And if (as our aduersaries say) the sacramentall being of Iesus Christ is destroyed, it followeth that the same sacramentall being is sacrificed. Then that sacramentall being is the price of our redemption: for that which is sacrificed to God ought to be the price of our redemption. Now Iesus Christ in his naturall being is our redemption, which was destroyed vpon the Crosse, and not in a sacramentall being, that is, significantly, which is a *Chimera* and a meere fiction. So that nothing is destroyed in the sacrifice of the Masse, which can be our redemption. Adde hereunto, that the destruction of the *species* or accidents being done onely in the Priests Romacke when the same *species* dissolue by digestion, we ought to say, that the sacrifice is not done till certaine houres.

after

*Bellarm. lib.
1. de Missa.
cap. 2. §. Se-
cundum. In
omni sacrifi-
cio proprie
dicto requiri-
tur res aliqua
sensibilis qua
offeratur.*

after the Masse is finished, and that the Priests stonacke is the altar, and that the sacrifice is made about two or three of the clocke in the afternoone.

17 And when it is to be defined, in what action or part of the Masse the sacrifice formally consisteth, nothing troubleth our Doctors more then that, notwithstanding all their subtiltie. If they say, their sacrifice consisteth in the elevation of the host, then Iesus Christ did not sacrifice, for he vsed no such elevation; if in the breaking of the consecrated bread, then Iesus Christ did not sacrifice, for he brake the bread before he pronounced those words wherein the Church of Rome makes the Consecration to consist. And if that which is broken in the Eucharist or Sacrament is sacrificed; by that reckoning Iesus Christ sacrificed nothing but bread. And Iesus Christ remaineth whole vnder the *species* of bread and wine, and by consequence is not broken vnder the *species*, & therefore is not sacrificed.

And if they say, the sacrifice consisteth in the eating, then the Priests mouth is the altar for the sacrifice; and by that reason, as many as are communicants are so many sacrificing Priests.

They are no lesse troubled touching the Consecration, that is, whether the Sacrifice formally consisteth in the Consecration; for they agree not among themselves about the words by the which Christ consecrated. Pope Innocent the third, in the sixth Chap. and fourth booke of the Masse, is of opinion, that Iesus Christ did not consecrate by these words, *This is my body*; but that he had consecrated before by his diuine vertue. And all the ancient Fathers with one accord say, that Consecration is made by prayer. Whereupon the Grecians call Consecration, *Invocation* and *Prayer*. At this day they say, that Consecration is done by these words, *This is my body*, which are no words of Sacrifice nor Oblation, because they offer nothing vnto God, neither are directed vnto God, but to the Apostles; *Take, eat, this is my body which is broken for you*. And if to consecrate be to sacrifice, then by this reason it will follow, that consecrating of dayes,

of

Sand dici potest, quod Christus virtute diuina consecrat: & postea formam expressit sub qua postest benedicere. Ipse namque per suam virtutem propria benedicit, non autem ex illa virtute quam indidit verbis. Catharinus & Capitefontain, haue made two bookes expressly of this matter.

of the Temple, and of the vessels belonging thereunto, are so many Sacrifices.

18 Touching this point we haue Inuincible reasons, which hold our Aduersaries so fast bound that they can by no means vnloose themselues. They say, (and that with good reason) that in all Sacrifices, that which is offered vnto God ought to be consecrated. But in the Masse, that which is sacrificed to God is not consecrated. Therefore nothing is sacrificed vnto God in the Masse. That no consecrated thing is offered to God in the Masse, it appeareth hereby; that if any consecrated thing is offered to God in the Masse, it must either be the Bread, or the accidents of the Bread, or else the Body of Christ. But it is not the Bread, for it is no more bread (as they say) after the consecrating words are pronounced; nor the accidents of the Bread, for they are not offred vnto God: The colour, the roundnesse, and the breadth of bread without bread, is not a fit and proper offering for our redemption. Nor the body of Iesus Christ, for he cannot be consecrated by vs; seeing that on the contrarie, it is he that consecrateth vs, as the Apostle saith, Hebr. 10. 14. *By one offering hath he consecrated for ever them that are sanctified.* So there is nothing that is consecrated in the Masse which the Priest can offer vnto God. Here our Aduersaries are at a stay, and say that the bread is consecrated, but tell not what consecrated thing is offered to God in the Masse.

*Reasons which our Aduersaries alledge for the
Sacrifice of the Masse.*

It is lamentable to heare the allegations of our Aduersaries vpon this subiect, and to see in what manner they alledge the Scriptures. 13. *Sol.*

1 They say *Molebizadech sacrificed Bread and Wine.* Be it so, but what do they inferre thereupon? By that they conclude that the Priest in the Masse sacrificeth the bodie and bloud of Christ. This consequence is ridiculous, and made

as it were of set purpose to discredit their cause: for from thence rather it would follow, that the Priest sacrificeth nothing but bread and wine, no more then *Melchizedech* did.

I could shew by ^a *Philo* the Jew, by *Iosephus*, by the Chaldean Paraphrase, and by diuers of our Aduersaries themselves, as by *Hugo de S. Villare*, and by Cardinall *Cameran*, and also by the Romish Bible, that in Genes. 14. 18. from whence this place is taken, it is not said, That *Melchizedech* sacrificed, but that he brought forth, or presented bread and wine, to refresh *Abraham* and his souldiers, not to make an offering unto God. I could shew likewise, that the Apostle in Hebr. 7. 1. compareth *Melchizedech* to Iesus Christ, not in this, that he sacrificed bread and wine, but herein, that he is set downe to be without father or mother. Also in this, that he was a King and a Priest. And in this, that he blessed *Abraham*, and took tithes of him as his superiour.

I could also shew ^b that the Romish Bible hath falsified this place, and hath put an *enim* for an *et*, and translates, *For he was a Priest of the most high God*, in stead of, *And he was a Priest of the most high God*, according to the Hebrew and the Chaldean Paraphrase: or as the Septuagint Interpreters translate it: *But he was a Priest*. But it is needlesse to take so much paines to confute so ridiculous an argument, and which is alledged to proue that the Masse is a sacrifice of bread and wine. One thing is not to be omitted, that is, that our Aduersaries make two sorts of Sacrifices, one bloody, the other without blood: one according to the order of *Aaron*, the other according to the order of *Melchizedech*: one of lesse excellence, the other of more excellencie; and say that the Masse is that excellent Sacrifice, according to the order of *Melchizedech*. By this meanes they make the Masse to be more excellent then the death of Iesus Christ, which is a bloody Sacrifice, and which by consequence is not a Sacrifice according to the order of *Melchizedech*. But the Apostle in Hebr. 5. 6. 7. maketh *Melchizedech*'s Sacrifice to be bloody: for there he sheweth, that Iesus Christ at his death did execute the office of a Priest after the order of *Melchizedech*.

How-

^a *Philo lib. de Abraham. 10.*
^b *Iosephus lib. 1. Antiquitat. b*
^c *Peterius Iesuita in Gl. ca. 14. 18. & 20. Hebraea lectio Latine ad verbum conuersa, sic expressit hunc locum. Es Melchizedech rex Salis protulit panem & vinum. & ipse erat Sacerdos Dei altissimi: & paulo post Caesarius quasi vulgarem translationem non approbat. Quod (inquie) in vulgata editione subditur, ut causa oblationis, erat enim sacerdos Dei altissimi, in Hebraeo non habetur ut causa, sed ut separata clausula.*

^c The version of the 70.
^d *Iesuita Iesuita in Gl. ca. 14. 18. & 20. Hebraea lectio Latine ad verbum conuersa, sic expressit hunc locum. Es Melchizedech rex Salis protulit panem & vinum. & ipse erat Sacerdos Dei altissimi: & paulo post Caesarius quasi vulgarem translationem non approbat. Quod (inquie) in vulgata editione subditur, ut causa oblationis, erat enim sacerdos Dei altissimi, in Hebraeo non habetur ut causa, sed ut separata clausula.*

Howsoever, seeing that the Priesthood of *Melchizedek* continueth for ever, *Psal. 118. 4. Hebr. 7. 6.* I cannot see how our Aduersaries can affirme that the Masse is the Sacrifice of *Melchizedek*; for they say that it shall no more be done after the day of iudgement, and that before the day of iudgement Antichrist shall abolish it.

2 With the like subtiltie they alledge the Paschall Lamb, to proue that the Eucharist is a Sacrifice. They say, the Paschall Lambe was a Sacrifice: and therefore, that the Eucharist which is ordained in stead thereof, is a Sacrifice. Whereby they go about to proue that which is not in question betweene vs. The speciall point of difference is, whether the body of Christ is really sacrificed in the Eucharist; and not, whether the Eucharist is in some sence a Sacrifice.

3 They likewise make a great shew of the place in *Malachie 1. 11.* where it is said; *For from the rising of the Sunne, euen vnto the going downe of the same, my Name shall be great among the Gentiles, and in every place Incense shall be offered vnto my Name, and a pure offering.* In this place I see nothing spoken of sacrificing the bodie of Christ, nor of making a propitiatorie Sacrifice for the liuing and for the dead. In more then a dozen places of the New Testament, prayers, almes, puritie and innocencie of life, and the worke of the Ministerie are called Sacrifices. In that sence I doubt not but that the holy Supper may be called a Sacrifice; but yet a Sacrifice of Eucharist, that is, a sacrifice of Thank-giuing. And the word Oblation in *Malachie* is *mincha*, which signifieth a Cake with aspersiō of oyle, which was not offered in a propitiatorie sacrifice, but in a sacrifice of Thank-giuing.

This exposition disliketh our Aduersaries: for they will haue this pure oblation to be the sacrifice of the Masse, wherein Iesus Christ is sacrificed. An interpretation drawne out of the vñwritten word. For the Scripture speaketh not of sacrificing the body of Iesus Christ in the Masse; neither is there any shew thereof in that place.

The reasons why they reiect our exposition, although it be grounded vpon the Scripture, are, because prayers and almes.

almes are no new things, in that they were vsed in the Old Testament; but here (they say) he speaks of a new Oblation. I answer, that the ministerie of the Gospell, and the profession of Christian faith, are new things, and not vsed in the Old Testament: and these things also are called Sacrifices, Rom. 15. 15. 16. I say the same of the holy Supper, which by the same reason may be called a Sacrifice of praise and of thanksgiuing. And also, that touching the manner and forme of praying in the name of Iesus Christ, it began with the publication of the Gospell. And it is euident, that the same which *Malactias* specifeth to be new, is, that prayers and spirituall offerings should begin to be offered to God from the rising of the Sunne to the going downe of the same, by the vocation of the Gentiles.

But they reply, That prayers, almes, and spirituall Sacrifices, cannot be that pure offering, seeing that we say, that our best workes are vncleane and imperfect. I could shew that they wrong vs herein; but it sufficeth at this time, that the Ministerie of the Gospell and the Sacrament of the holy Supper, cannot (without blasphemie) be called impure or vncleane; for although that he which administreth them is a sinner, that changeth not their nature. The puritie of the Gospell and of the Sacraments dependeth not vpon the puritie of those that pronounce and administer them.

4 The rest of the places which they alledge out of the old Testament, seeme rather to be alledged in least then for instruction; in the 1. of Sam. 2. 35. God foresheweth to *Hely*, that he would take the office of Priest from him, and would raise vp vnto himselfe a faithfull Priest, to whom he would build a sure house. And Prouerbs 9. 1. *Wisdom* hath built her house, she hath killed her beasts, she hath mingled her wine, she hath also furnished her table. Therefore (say they) the Priest sacrificeth Iesus Christ in the Masse. To prooue the Masse by these places of the Scripture, is all one as to warme themselves by the Moone light.

5 Now let vs come to the new Testament. First, they alledge these words, *This is my body*. But we will speake of the sence

sence of these words hereafter when we come to speake of Transubstantiation. Now let vs put the case that by these words the bread should be transubstantiated into the body of Christ; and what makes that for the sacrifice? Is the body of our Lord Iesus Christ sacrificed in every place where it is? And say that the body of Iesus Christ should be really in the Priests hands, yet the Priest must not sacrifice it, vnlesse God command him so to do. Now that commandement is it which we desire to see, but they could neuer yet produce it.

6 Being put from that, they insilt vpon the words that follow, *This is my body which is given for you, or which is broken for you.* From whence they inferre, that seeing those words are spoken of the present time, it must needs be that Iesus Christ at that present time brake his body, and gaue it to his disciples.

This is to play with the Scriptures, and (in effect) to renounce their Bible and their beleefe. For they which dispute in that manner, should learne by the Romish Bible, by the Masse, and by their owne Doctores, that Iesus Christ in those words speaketh of giuing his body to die for vs, and of the breaking of his bodie vpon the crosse. For that which Saint Paul saith, *Which is broken for you*, the Romane translation saith, *Quod pro vobis tradetur*, which shall be giuen for you. And in the consecration of the cup, in stead of *Which is shed*, both the Romish Bible and the Masse, haue *Effundetur*, which shall be shed, to giue them to vnderstand, that he spake not of any effusion then made, but of that which should be made at his death. It was our Saviours manner and vseto speake in that sort. In Matth. 26. 45. before any of the Iewes were come to lay hands on him, he said, *Behold the Sonne of man is giuen into the hands of Sinners.* And Iohn 10. 17. *I lay downe my life; that I may take it againe:* and 17. 11. *Now I am no more in the world.* And a little after, *When I was in the world, &c.* And Saint Paul 2. Tim. 4. 6. *I am already offered:* speaking of his death which was neare. And Iesus Christ administering that Sacrament had reason to speake of his death as present, because it was the euening before he died. So Saint Chrysostome vnderstood it in his 83. Sermon vpon Saint Matthew;

a vñ 3 Dya
narmidm dia
vis aqua tri pu
victor iel to
vndre 25 i cau
die.

b Eadem ra
tione qua E
uangelista su
turam in cruce
effusione san
guinis signi
ficauerunt in
presente effun
ditur, eadem
ratione Pau
lus futuram
in cruce fra
ctionem carnis

Christi signifi
cat in presen
ti, dicendo
Frangitur.

c Vñtur Do
minus presenti
tempori pro
paulo post fu
turo: de futura
enim & pro
pinqva passio
ne sunt verba
intelligenda.
Hoc sensus: Hoc
est corpus meū
quod pro vobis
passioni &
morti paulo
post dabitur.

his words are these. *This is my blood which is shed for the remission of sinnes: He said that, to shew that his passion and his crosse is a mysterie.* The Iesuiste say vpon the words of Saint Matthew, saith, *In Greeke it is said, which is shed, the time present for the time to come.* And Cardinall Caietan vpon the 22. of Luke b saith, *Even as the Euangelists by the time present haue expressed the future effusion of blood, saying, is shed, S. Paul likewise saying, is broken, signifieth by the present time the breaking of his body which was after to be done vpon the crosse.* Barradius Iesuiste c in the 4. Tome of his Harmonie of the Euangelists, lib. 3. cap. 4. saith, *The Lord vsaeth the time present in stead of the future time which then approached; for the words ought to be vnderstood of his future passion which then drew nearer in this sence; This is my body which shall shortly be giuen for you, to suffer and to die.*

It cannot be said, that these words, *is giuen, and is broken,* can be vnderstood presently and futurely: for one selfe same word cannot signifie both present and future. For the Masse and the Romish Bible should do wrong to translate those words in the future tence, if they were to be vnderstood in the present tence. Euery saithfull translator which translateth that which is spoken in the present tence by the future tence, doth it because there is an inconuenience to vnderstand it in the present tence, and to follow the litterall sence. And it is not to be doubted, that if he which set that downe in the Canon of the Masse, had beleueed the real sacrifice as at this day it is beleueed, he would haue left the word *effunditur* in the present tence, to support his owne opinion, and would not haue beleueed himselfe of that little weake defence which the Gospell affoord him. I say a weake defence, because these words read in the present tence, and translated according to the Greeke copie, make nothing for the reall sacrifice of Christs body in the Eucharist. For the action it selfe which is a Sacrament, bindeth vs to beleue that they are sacramentall words, and that the sence of those words is, that in the Eucharist the body of our Lord is broken, and his blood shed sacramentally, and to represent the breaking and the shedding of his body and

and blood vpon the crosse. In the same manner that the bread in that place is called the body of Christ, and the cup the covenant. Therefore it is expedient to translate it in the present tence, that all the speech may be sacramentall, and conformable to the nature of the action.

For the clearing of the truth, nothing maketh more then the diuersitie of words which S. Luke and S. Paul vse touching the same; the one saying, *Which is giuen*, the other saying, *Which is broken*. For if S. Luke vnderstands, that the body of our Lord is really and actually giuen in the Sacrament, we must also say that S. Paul vnderstood, that in the same Sacrament the body of our Lord is really and actually broken: which the Church of Rome beleeueth not. For they are things disagreeing, to say, that the body of our Lord is really broken vnder the *species*, & yet that it is whole vnder the *species*. The body of our Lord is not broken vnder the *species*, seeing it remaineth whole vnder the *species*. They are as much combred about the shedding of the blood. For they say, that the blood of our Lord is shed in the Eucharist, and yet that it stirreth not, and that it comes not out of the body nor from the veines. That it is shed vnder the *species*, and yet that it stirreth not from vnder the *species*. And as it is certaine that all shedding is a mouing, they make a shedding without mouing. They say that the blood of the body of Christ is shed, and yet that not one drop of blood comes out. These men are angry when they are contradicted, and in the meane time they contradict themselves: they will be beleueed, and yet they beleue not that which themselves say.

And this will be yet more absurd, when it shall appeare that the Romish Church beleueth that the body is whole in euery drop of the wine in the cup, & that in the cup the blood is not out of the body: in such manner, that it is the body which is shed, and the Priest drinks the flesh and the bones. It seemes that these men were in doubt to be beleueed, and tooke pleasure to heape vp a number of absurd conceptions.

7 Some much please themselves with an opinion of acutenesse in reasoning on this maner: All shedding of blood made

for remission of finnes, is a propitiatory sacrifice. But Iesus Christ saith that his blood is shed in the Eucharist for the remission of finnes. Ergo the Eucharist is a propitiatory sacrifice.

The first proposition is not vniuersally true. For there is a shedding of blood sacramentall and not reall; which is made to represent the shedding of Christs blood vpon the crosse: and that is no propitiatory sacrifice. Therefore to take away the ambiguitie, the first proposition ought to be made in this manner, *All reall shedding of blood made for the remission of finnes, is a propitiatory sacrifice.* And yet still the proposition will beare exceptions. For in the circumcision of Iesus Christ there was a reall shedding of the Lords blood made for the remission of our finnes, and yet circumcision was no sacrifice. The reall shedding of blood is then a propitiatory sacrifice, when it is made by the death of the thing offered.

The second proposition also is false: for in the Eucharist Iesus Christ saith well that his blood is shed, but saith not that it was shed in the Eucharist. In this question we speake of a reall shedding, without which there can be no reall propitiatory sacrifice.

8 Their most vsuall obiection against vs is out of Acts 13. 2. where it is said, *As they ministred to the Lord*, and in the Romish Bible it is, *Ministrantibus illis Domino*: that is, as they serued the Lord in their ministerie, conformable to the Greeke, *λατρευοντες αυτον ως κυριον*. They would needs haue (but I know not why) this seruice to be the Masse. For these our Maisters will haue it so. Say it were so, (although there is neither reason nor colour for it) and let vs beleeue that theret is said, that the Apostles were assembled together to sing Masse: yet still the difficultie remaineth, that is, whether in that sacrifice they sacrificed the body of Iesus Christ. Furthermore I know not what moueth them to interpret *λατρευοντες* to sacrifice. By the same reason we must say that the Angels sing Masse, and sacrifice Iesus Christ, seeing that in Heb. 1. 14. the Angels are called ministering spirits, *παιδες*

και πνεύματα. We must also say that Epaphroditus sacrificed and song Masse, seeing Saint Paul, Philip 2. 25. calleth him λειτουργον, administrator. But Saint Paul refuteth that, and expoundeth himselfe, saying, He that ministred unto me such things as I wanted.

λειτουργον
χρησας μου.

9 Some also alledge this place for the Masse, Heb. 13. 10. We haue an altar, whereof they haue no authoritie to eate which serue in the tabernacle. By this altar they will haue the Apostle to vnderstand the sacrifice of the Masse, and that in this Masse Iesus Christ is sacrificed: which are great suppositions without proofes. But Cardinall * Bellarmine in the sixt chapter of his first booke of the Masse, reiecteth this place, and all whatsoever they can alledge out of that Epistle for the Masse. For he acknowledgeth that the Apostle in all the Epistle to the Hebrewes speaketh nothing of the Eucharist, saying, That the Apostle maketh no mention of the sacrifice of bread and wine. And a little after he saith, The Apostle hath expressly omitted the oblation of bread and wine, lest he should be constrained to expound the myserie of the Eucharist, which was too high a subiect to be comprehended by those to whom he wrote. Reade the whole place of the Apostle, and you shall see that he speaketh of the death of Iesus Christ which he suffered without the gate: of which sacrifice the crosse was the altar. Where also he speaketh but of one altar in the singular number. In this sacrifice the Apostle saith that those that serue in the tabernacle of ceremonies haue no participation.

* Respondet:
Et s. Accidit.
Apostolus non
meminit sacri-
ficij panis &
vini. Et paulo
post. Apostolus
dedita opera
omisit oblationem
panis &
vini, ne cogere-
retur explicare
mysterium
Eucharistie,
quod altius erat
quam ut
ab illis capi
tunc posset.

How and in what sence the holy Supper may be
called a sacrifice.

The holy Scriptures call almes, prayers, an humble and contrite heart, martyrdome, the Ministerie of the Gospell, and generally all kind of good workes, sacrifices.

1 But there are two particular reasons why the holy Sup-

Ff 3

14. Se 7.
Phil. 4. 18.
Heb. 13. 16.
Psal 51. 19. 7
2. Tim 4. 6.
per, Rom. 15. 16.

per may be called a sacrifice. First, because that Sacrament was instituted to declare the death of our Lord vntill he comes againe, 1. Cor. 11. 26. In that sence the holy Supper may be called a sacrifice, because it representeth the sacrifice of the death of our Lord: as the manner is, that signes and representations ordinarily haue the names of that which they signifie.

2 It may be said, that in the holy Supper we offer Iesus Christ vnto God, in as much as we pray vnto God that he would receive the sacrifice of his death for a satisfaction for our sinnes.

3 Thirdly, the holy Supper is a sacrifice of thanksgiuing for the benefites which God hath bestowed vpon vs, and chiefly for the benefit of our redemption by Iesus Christ.

4 The ancient Church had a particular reason to call the holy Supper a sacrifice; for then the custome and manner was, that euery communicant brought gifts and presents which they set vpon the table, whereof one part was employed for the holy Supper, the rest was for the nourishment of the poore: and those presents were called sacrifices and oblations. Saint Cyprian in the ninth Epistle of his first booke commandeth the Priests, that *receiuing the offerings of the people which contributed, they should not depart from the altar nor from the sacrifice.* And in his Sermon of Almes, he saith, *Thou rich woman, which thinkest to celebrate the Supper of the Lord, which hast no care to bring an offering, which comest to the Supper of the Lord without a sacrifice, which takest part of the sacrifice which the poore haue offered.* Reade Theodoretus in the third booke of his Historie, chap. 12. and lib. 4. cap. 19. For these causes the ancient Fathers ordinarily called that Sacrament a sacrifice. Which they did the rather, because that thereby they brought infidels and Pagans to Christian religion: for their opinion was that a religion without sacrifices was no religion: as by the reproches that Pagans gaue to Christians it appeareth. For Origen in his fourth booke against Celsus, saith, that Christians had neither altars, images, nor temples. And in the Dialogue of Minutius

Felix,

Felix, the Pagan *Cacilius* saith, *Cur nullas aras habent Christiani, nulla templa, nulla nota simulacra?* How cometh it that the Christians haue no altars, nor temples, nor images that are scene? And in the beginning of the 7. booke of *Arnobius*, the Pagans said, *Do you thinke then that no sacrifices are to be made?* And thereupon the Christians answered and said, *No, none at all.*

Quid ergo?
Sacrificia con-
secris nulla om-
nino esse faci-
enda?

Resp. Nulla.

Therefore there being two sorts of sacrifices, the one propitiatorie and of redemption, the other Eucharisticall and of thanksgiuing, the holy Supper is a propitiatorie sacrifice, significantly and in commemoration, in the same manner that the Cup is the Testament, and that the bread is the body of Christ: and as circumcision was the covenant of God, and the rocke from whence water issued forth was Christ, as the Scripture saith. But to speake properly, the holy Supper is a Sacrifice of thanksgiuing, and as it is said in the Canon of the Masse, *Sacrificium laudis*, a sacrifice of praise. Therefore the ancient fathers called it Eucharist, that is to say, a thanksgiuing.

You must not thinke it strange that one selfe same action should be called a Sacrament and a sacrifice. Albeit there is as much difference betweene a Sacrament and a sacrifice, as betweene giuing, and taking or receiuing. So the Lords holy Supper may be a Sacrament, in as much as therein God giueth and communicateth his graces vnto vs; and a sacrifice, because therein we offer praise and thanksgiuing vnto him.

*The opinion of the ancient Fathers touching the
sacrifice of the Eucharist.*

This is a point which euery man takes vpon him to know. 15. Sect.
For there is nothing easier then to collect places out of the ancient Fathers, taken vpon trust of another, and so to make a booke. But to sound into the depth of them, and to find their

manner of writing for the time, the alteration of words and customes in severall ages, their intents, and the occasions and consequences of abuses which ages and times ensuing haue disclosed, is a thing whereunto few men attaine, and for which 20. yeares study is a small time.

For the foure reasons aforesaid, the ancient Fathers called the Eucharist a sacrifice, and a sacrifice of the body of Christ, and a sacrifice of our redemption. But where occasion serued they gaue vs enough to vnderstand, that their meaning is sound, and altogether contrary to our aduersaries opinions. To prooue it I will produce a few places out of them.

The booke of Faith written to *Peter* the Deacon, were it *Augustines* or *Fulgentius* his disciples, in the 19. chapter saith, ^a *The vniuersall Church throughout all the world doth not cease to offer a sacrifice of bread and wine in faith and charitie. For in the carnall flesh-offerings (of the old Testament) there was a representation of the flesh of Christ, which he being without sinne, was to offer for our sinnes; and of his blood, which he was to shed for the remission of our sinnes. But in this sacrifice (of the Eucharist) there is a thanksgiving and a commemoration of the flesh of Christ which he offered for vs, and of his blood which the same God shed for vs.* Note here specially that they offered a sacrifice of bread and wine, in commemoration of the flesh and blood of Iesus Christ that was broken and shed for vs.

And in the 17. chapter of the 17. booke of the Citie of God, he saith, ^b *To este the bread in the new Testament, is the sacrifice of Christians.*

And in the 20. booke against *Faustus* the Manichee, chap. 21. he saith, ^c *This flesh and blood of Christ was promised before his comming, by the resemblance of sacrifices: in*

a *Sacrificium panis & vini in fide & charitate, sancta Ecclesia Catholica per vniuersum orbem terra offerre non cessat. In illis enim carnalibus victimis, figuratio fuit carnis Christi quam pro peccatis nostris ipse sine peccato fuerat oblaturus, & sanguinis qui erat effusus in remissionem peccatorum nostrorum. In isto autem sa-*

cristio gratiarum actio atque commemoratio est carnis Christi quam pro nobis obtulit; &c. b Manducare panem est in nouo Testamento sacrificium Christianorum, c Huius caro & sanguis ante aduentum Christi per victimarum similitudinem promittebatur, in passione Christi per ipsam veritatem reddebatur: Post ascensum Christi per Sacramentum memoria celebratur.

the passion of Christ it was truly exhibited. After the ascension of Christ it is celebrated by the Sacrament of commemoration.

In his 23. Epistle to Boniface he saith: Oftentimes when the passion approacheth, we say, To morrow or the next day is the passion of our Lord, although there are so many yeares past since he suffered; and that the same passion was done but once. And upon the Sabbath day we say, This day the Lord rose againe, though there are so many yeares past since his resurrection. Why doth not some vaine fellow tell vs that we lie, in saying so, but because that day is called the Sonnes day, which is not the same day, but like unto it, by reuolution of time? ^a Was not Christ once sacrificed in his body? and yet he is sacrificed to the people in a sacred signe, not onely at euery solemnization of the feast of Easter, but also euery day. And yet he lieth not, who being asked that question, maketh answer and saith, That he is sacrificed. For if the Sacraments had not some resemblance of the things whereof they are Sacraments, they should not be Sacraments. Now for this resemblance most commonly they haue the name of the things themselves.

And to shew how he vnderstandeth the word Sacrament, in the tenth booke and fifth chapter of the Citie of God, he saith thus, ^b The visible sacrifice is a Sacrament, that is, a sacred signe of the inuisible Sacrifice. And a little after, That which men call a Sacrifice, is a signe of the true Sacrifice. And in his 5. Epistle to Marcelline, he saith, ^c The signes when they belong to diuine things, are called Sacraments.

In the Canon *Hoc est*, taken out of Saint Augustine, in the second Distinction of Consecration, these words are found: ^d The sacrifice of the flesh which is made by the hands of the Priest, is called the passion, the death, and the crucifying, not in truth, but in a significant mysterie, in the same manner as the Sacrament of faith, whereby we vnderstand

a Nonne semel immolatus est Christus in ipso. Et tamen in Sacramento non solum per omnes pascha solemnitates, sed omni die populus immolatur. Nec tamen que mentitur qui interrogatus cum responderit, immolari. Si enim Sacramenta quandam similitudinem earum rerum quarum Sacramenta sunt non haberent, omnino Sacramenta non essent. Ex hac autem similitudine plerumque etiam ipsarum

Baptisme,

Baptisme is called faith.

In the booke of the Sentences of Prosper, gathered out of Saint *Augustine*, in the same Distinction this place is alleged; ^a *Jesus Christ was but once sacrificed in his own body, and yet he is every day sacrificed in the Sacrament: that is,* (as he expounded it before) *in a sacred signe.* And thereupon the ancient Glosses of the Romish Church note in the margin: ^b *Christ is sacrificed, that is, his Sacrifice is represented, and a commemoration is made of his passion.*

^a Can. Semel.
Dist. 2. De Co-
suetat.

^b Christus
immolatur,
id est, immo-
latus eius re-
presentatur:
est memo-
ria passionis.

^c Passio est
Domini sacri-
ficium quod
offerimus.
et in danda
Eucharistia
immo, et
offerimus
Christi dicitur,
est ad nos
passio.

^d In danda Eu-
charistia ad nos
passio, et ad
nos danda, et
passio, et ad
nos danda, et
passio, et ad
nos danda, et
passio.

Therefore also the Fathers not onely say, That the Sacrifice which is offered in the Church is the Sacrifice of the bodie of Christ, but also, that the same Sacrifice which they offer is his death and passion. Saint *Cyprian*, in his third Epistle and second booke saith: ^c *In all the Sacrifices which we offer, we make mention of his passion: for the sacrifice which we offer is his passion.* And *Chrysostome* in his 21. Homilie vpon the Acts, (speaking of the holy Supper, saith, ^d *While this death is finished, and this dreadfull sacrifice, and these vnutterable mysteries.* The body therefore of Iesus Christ is taken and sacrificed in the Eucharist in the same manner as he dieth there, that is, as it is said before in the Romish Decretall, *not in truth, but in a significant mystrie.*

Chrysostome in his seuenteenth Homilie vpon the Epistle to the Hebrewes, saith: ^e *We alwaies offer the same Sacrifice: or to speake more properly, we make a commemoration of the same Sacrifice.*

Ensebius in the tenth chapter of his first booke of the Demonstration of the Gospell, saith, ^f *Seeing that we haue receiued the memorie of this Sacrifice to celebrate the same vpon the Table thereof by the signes of his body and of his blood, according to the institution of the new Testament, we are taught by the Prophet David, saying, Thou hast prepared my Table, &c.* And it is to be noted, that the same chapter being very long, speaketh of nothing else but of the Sacrifices both of the old and new Testament; but speaketh not of sacrificing of the body of our Lord in the Eucharist, but onely of celebrating the memorie thereof.

Infin

Iustin Martyr against Tripbon saith, & The oblation of the Cake of fine flower was a figure of the bread in the Eucharist, which Iesus Christ hath commanded vs to do in commemoration of his death. gPag. 201.
 Edit. Cornel.
 ἡ τῆς σιμωλῆος
 ἀνέσθη τὴ
 νος καὶ τὴ ἀγία
 τὴς ἀρχιεπισκοπῆς
 ἐν οἷς ἀνιμῶνται
 τὴ πῶδες λόγος
 χρίστος ὁ κύριος
 ἡμῶν ὑπερίστατος
 ποιεῖν,
 ἡ ἀποστολὴν
 ἐκκαλεῖται τὰ τοῦ
 κυρίου ἀντι
 κεινὰ τὰ ἀντιμαρτυ
 ρητικὰ, πᾶς
 τὸ πῶδες διὰ
 ἀποκαλῆς ἀντι
 στατον.

It is the propertie of Grammarians, and specially of those that make Dictionaries, to name things by their names, and to speake simply. So doth *Suidas* the Grammarian, in the word *Ecclesia*. ^h *The Church* (saith he) *maketh an oblation of the signes of the body and of the blood of Christ, sanctifying the whole lump by the first fruits.*

The Priest in the Masse speaketh as though he beleued not that that which he sacrificeth is the body of Iesus Christ, seeing he offereth that Sacrifice by Iesus Christ; and desireth that the Angels would present that Oblation vnto God, and carry it to his heavenly altar; for Iesus Christ hath no need of the aide of Angels to present him to his Father. And it also appeareth in this, that he calleth this oblation, * *gifts, and presents*, in the plurall number, which God *blesseth, createth, quickeneth, and alwaies sanctifieth*: of all which words, none can be applyed to Iesus Christ. For it is hard to be conceiued how the consecrated Sacrifice or Host may be called *All these good things*, if Iesus Christ be the Host. And it is likewise more hardly to be comprehended how God continually createth Iesus Christ: and how he blesseth and quickeneth Iesus Christ by Iesus Christ. These words haue a good meaning, being spoken of the bread and wine, but not of Iesus Christ. If by these words the Priest vnderstandeth that he speaketh of the bread and the wine, and giueth thanks to God because he alwaies createth and quickeneth those things, he falleth into three ineuitable adfurdities. The first is, that he giueth thanks to God because he createth the bread and the wine in the Eucharist, when according to their doctrine there is neither bread nor wine. The second, that he sheweth the bread and the wine as being present, saying *All these good things*, when those things are no more those things, being (as they say) transubstantiated into flesh and blood. Adde hereunto, that these words are said at the very same time

* Per Christum
 Dominum no-
 strum per quē
 hac omnia
 Domine sem-
 per bona cre-
 as, sanctificas,
 viuificas, be-
 nedicens et pro-
 stans nobis.

time when the Priest lifts vp the Host to cause it to be adored. But is not this a thing against all reason and apparence, that then when men adore the Host, and when they sacrifice, the eternall Sonne of God to God for the redemption of soules, in stead of praising God for so great a benefite, they giue him thanks because he maketh the corne to grow, and that he createth and blesseth it continually? That is all one in effect, as if when God admitteth any one into the Church by Baptisme, men should giue thanks vnto God because he created the water, and maketh fountaines and riuers continually to runne.

To be short, the truth is so strong, that our Aduersaries out of the heate of disputation, ordinarily say as we say. Reade *Lombard* in the fourth booke of Sentences, the twelfth Distinction, at the letter *G*: and *Thomas Aquinas* in the third part of his Summes, Question 83. Article 1, and you shall see that they wholly agree with vs: and that they say, that the Eucharist is called a Sacrifice for no other reason, but because that therein a commemoration is made of the sacrifice of the Crosse, and because the sacrifice of the death of our Lord is therein applied vnto vs, that we may be partakers of that benefite.

Of Baptisme, and of the necessitie thereof.

The same 35. Article of our Confession speaketh of Baptisme, and particularly of the baptisme of little children, in these words:

Neuerthelesse, because God receiueth little children into his Church with their fathers, we say, that by the authoritie of Iesus Christ, yong children that are begotten by Christian parents ought to be baptized.

Against this *M. Arnonx* reasoneth in this manner.

ARNONX.

ARNOYE.

By this Article they pretend to inferre that children begotten by 16. Sect.
Christian parents are receiued into the Church by the faith of
their fathers.

MOVLIN.

This is vntrue: we pretend not to auouch that, neither is it
our beleefe. Baptisme is conferred to diuers children whose
fathers and mothers are both without faith and pietie. That
indeed was Bernards opinion in his 77. Epistle, saying, *Who
knoweth not, that touching little children the faith of their fathers
only auaileth for them, yea and is sufficient?* But we say not so.

ARNOYE.

By this Article also they pretend to iustifie, that although little 17. Sect.
children ought to be baptized, yet if they be not baptized, they
are saved without baptisme, which is a point of their beleefe.

Places alledged to the contrary. Iohn. 3. 3. Verily verily I say
vnto thee, Except a man be borne againe, he cannot see the kingdome
of heauen. Note this word againe, which manifestly prometh that
he which is not regenerated by Baptisme is not receiued into the
Church. And verse 5. Verily verily I say vnto thee, Except that a
man be borne of water and of the spirit he cannot enter into the
kingdome of God. And verse 7. Thou must be borne againe. To what
end then serueth it to be begotten by Christian parents?

Places noted in the margent of the Confession, Math. 19. 14.
But Iesus said, Suffer the little children, and forbid them not to
come to me, for of such is the kingdome of heauen. Doth it there-
fore follow that they are receiued into it with their fathers, and
that we must not baptize them as we say onely by Tradition, or that
they are saved without Baptisme? 1. Cor. 7. 14. For the vnbelleeuing
husband is sanctified by the wife, and the vnbelleeuing wife is sancti-
fied by her husband, else were your children vncleane, but now they
are holy. If this word holy were not an equivocation, this place
would haue some shew for them; but it is too manifest & plaine, that
the word holy when it is spoken of children, ought to be taken in the
same sence as a little before in the same place is beareth, where
when:

when it is spoken of a man and his wife. For neither the one nor the other being infidels, are properly sanctified by him that is faithfull. Then this sanctification as well of the married couple, as of their children, consisteth herein, that as marriage is holy because it is lawfull, and in this sence those that are married are sanctified one by the other: so the children that are borne of that marriage are holy, because they are lawfully begotten, and issued from an holy marriage. Therefore the Apostle understands, that if the faithfull should by divorce separate himselfe from the infidell, onely because of infidelitie, two mischiefs would thereby ensue; the one, that the infidell thereby should not have the meanes to be converted, nor to be sanctified by conversation with the faithfull: the other, that the children left with the infidell, which would convert them to his owne religion, could not be taught the faith and worshipping of God, as they are when their fathers and mothers live together.

MOVLIN.

Of the signification of the word Baptisme.

This discourse is intrangled and badly contrived. Whereunto whosoever should exactly answer, he must not respect the soundnesse of his reasons but the importance of the matter: but to proceed orderly herein, first I will speake of the word Baptisme, and of baptizing, and then of the thing it selfe.

To *baptize* is a Greeke word, which signifieth to dip into the water and to wash. In this generall sence washings in the old Testament are called Baptismes, ^a Marke 7. 4. ^b Heb. 9. 10.

The word Baptisme is sometimes taken figurately, for affliction and persecution for the Gospell: as Marke 10. 38, where it is said, *Can ye drinke of the cup that I shall drinke of, and be baptized with the baptisme that I shall be baptized with?* speaking of the participation of his afflictions. See Luke 12, 50. Oftentimes also it is taken for purging and sanctifying of

a 𐎧𐎠𐎡𐎢𐎣𐎤𐎥
 𐎧𐎠𐎡𐎢𐎣𐎤𐎥 𐎧𐎠𐎡𐎢𐎣𐎤𐎥
 b 𐎧𐎠𐎡𐎢𐎣𐎤𐎥
 𐎧𐎠𐎡𐎢𐎣𐎤𐎥 𐎧𐎠𐎡𐎢𐎣𐎤𐎥
 𐎧𐎠𐎡𐎢𐎣𐎤𐎥

the heart, and for effusion of the graces of the holy Ghost. So Acts 1. 5. Christ promised his disciples, *That they should be baptized with the holy Ghost within few dayes.* And Iohn Baptist saith, *That Iesus Christ baptizeth vs with the holy Ghost and with fire,* Matthew 3. 11.

But ordinarily Baptisme is taken for the Sacrament of our entrance into the Christian Church, & of the cleansing of our finnes by the blood of Iesus Christ, and by the power and efficacy of his Spirit. A Sacrament which Iesus Christ hath sanctified in his owne person, and established by his owne ordinance. Which succeeded circumcision, which S. Paul calleth the seale of the righteousness of faith. Rom. 4. 11.

This Baptisme is conferred by dipping him into, or sprinkling of water vpon him that is baptized, saying, *I baptise thee in the name of the Father, and of the Sonne, and of the holy Ghost,* Matth. 28. 19.

If we take this word Baptisme generally for a washing or a sprinkling, or in a figurative sence for affliction, or for the effusion of the graces of the holy Ghost, we confesse that there are diuers baptismes: as the Apostle Hebr. 6. 2. speaketh of *the doctrine of baptisme* in the plurall number. But if we take it for that sprinkling of water which is a marke of Christianity, and a Sacrament of our entering into the Church, there is but one Baptisme: as the Apostle saith Ephesians 4. 5. 6. *There is one Lord, one Faith, one Baptisme, one God and Father of all.* The Greeke saith *Baptisme is one.*

Touching this Baptisme, men dispute whether it be necessarie to saluation. First, we will speake of the necessitie thereof in those persons which are capable of instruction, and after of the same in little children.

*Of the necessitie of Baptisme in persons that are of
yeares of discretion.*

Touching those that haue attained to that age to be capable 18. Sect.

pable of instruction, the Church of Rome makes a shew to disagree with vs therein, but in effect they hold with vs, that the baptisme of water is not absolutely necessarie for them, & that if a man being of yeares of discretion dieth without baptisme, yet he may be saued, so that that want of baptisme happened not vnto him by reason of contempt, or for want of will and desire, but by want of meanes and conueniencie. The

** Qua quide
translatio, post
Euangelium
promulgatum
sine laqueo
regenerationis
aut eius voto
fieri nō potest.*

Councell of Trent in the first Session, chap. 41 saith, * *That a man cannot be admitted into the state of grace without the washing of regeneration, or without a desire, or a religious promise: That is, that no man can be acceptable vnto God without baptisme, or for want of baptisme, without the desire or will to be baptized.* And *Thomas* in his Commentarie vpon the third of Saint *Iohn* saith, that to enter into the kingdome of God, a man must be baptized, *vel in re, vel in voto, vel in figura, either in effect, or in desire, or in figure, &c.* In the 43.

** Presbyterum
quem sine vna
da baptismati
extremum di-
am clausse
significasti
quia in sancta
matris Eccle-
siae fide &
Christi nomi-
nis confessione
perseueraueris
ab originali
peccato soluti
& celestis pa-
triae gaudium
esse adeptum
asserimus in-
conuictum.*

Tide of the Decretals, cap. *Apolliticum*, Pope *Innocent* 3. declareth, that a Priest dying without baptisme enioyeth eternall glory, because he persueued in the confession of the name of Christ. For which cause, in the same Chapter Saint *Augustine* is alledged in the eight booke of the Citie of God, saying, *Baptismus inuisibiliter ministratur, quem non contemptus religionis, sed terminus necessitatis excludit: Baptisme is inuisibly administrated to him that hath bene debarrd thereof, not by contempt of religion, but by necessitie of time preuenting him.* And thereupon the Glosse of the Canonists Doctors noteth, that the Emperour *Valentinian* died without baptisme, and that neuertheless *Ambrose* in his Oration made vpon the death of that Emperour, saith that he was blessed in heauen. That which is specially to be noted in this Historie, is, that the Emperour *Valentinian* was a Christian borne, and had a thousand meanes to haue bene baptized, if he would.

To the same end, and to make baptisme by water ynne-cessary, the Church of Rome speaketh of two other baptis-
mes, which supply the want of baptisme by water, which
are, baptisme of the spirit, which is sanctification and inter-
iour renewing wrought by the Spirit of God; and baptisme
by

by blood which is martyrdome. But these two allegoricall baptismes are no Sacraments. For conuersion and renewing of a mans mind from sinnes, are not conferred by the ministerie of men, but it is a worke of the Spirit of God: wherein there is no element, nor any words added to the element. This can be no Sacrament of the new Testament, seeing that the same spirituall renewing was necessarie in the old Testament. And it cannot be said that this worke of the holy Ghost in the hearts of the faithfull doth supply the want of baptisme, seeing it is necessarie to saluation, whether a man be baptized, or not baptized.

Martyrdome also is no Sacrament of the new Testament, for that the same was in the old Testament. And the Councell of Trent declareth, that Sacraments are not conferred if he that conferreth them hath not an intent to conferre them. And it is not to be thought or beleueed, that the executioners of Martyrs haue an intent to conferre a Sacrament at their executions. And there is no likelihood, that of two Martyrs, whereof the one is baptized, the other not baptized, the martyrdome of the one should be a baptisme, and the others none. Neither can I see how the martyrdome of a man that is drowned or strangled without any effusion of blood, can be called a baptisme or washing in blood. Besides that, we often deceiue our selues in this word *Martyr*. For 1. Cor. 13. 3. the Apostle sheweth, that a man may giue his bodie to be burned, and yet haue no charity. It is a common thing among men to suffer martyrdome to win reputation. Among a number of the faithfull that are massacred in their beds without any leisure to speake, it is not vnlikely but that some of them would haue recanted for feare, if they had had any respite giuen them to think thereon. So that in calling him a Martyr which in Gods iudgement is not so, we giue the name of baptisme to sufferings which are vnworthy the name of martyrdome.

To be short, that rule so often times repeated in the Gospell, which is, *That whosoener beleaueth in Iesus Christ, shall haue life everlasting*, will beare no exception. Therefore he

that hath the faith of a Martyr, and loueth God more then his owne life, although God exempteth him from martyrdom; doth not lose the same reward. For God doth not reward the paines but the vertue of a man. Because dolour and paine may be suffered by hypocrites, but faith is proper to the children of God, to whom life eternall is promised: and the want of baptisme by default of meanes cannot annihilate Gods promise.

Of the necessitie of Baptisme in little children.

19. Sect.
Lombard. 4.
Sententiarum
Dist. 4. litt.
E. Si absque
baptismo fue-
rint defuncti,
etiam cum de-
ferentur ad
baptismum,
demonstratur.

Touching baptisme of little children, the discord is greater. Our aduersaries say, that baptisme with water is simply necessarie for them to saluation. And proceed so farre therein, that *Lombardus* saith, That if any infant which is brought to the Church to be baptized, dyeth by the way, it shall be damned. This they affirme by words, but denie it in effect. For they are of opinion, that martyrdom supplyeth the default of baptisme with water, and that a child which is not baptized with water, entred into the kingdome of God by martyrdom. And to prooue it they alledge the little children that were slaine by *Herod* in Bethleem and thereabouts as soone as they were borne, and all those that were two yeares old, whom the Church of Rome doth reuerence for Saints and Martyrs, without any distinction betweene those that were circumcised and those that were not circumcised.

But seeing that in the Church of Rome the godfather beleueth for the child which is baptized, and forsaketh the diuell for him, saying, *Credo & abrenuntio*, I maruell why the same godfather cannot also make a vow for the child, seeing that the Councell of Trent teacheth, that a vow supplyeth the want of baptisme.

It is likewise very requisite to be noted, that our aduersaries are of opinion, that the baptisme which Iesus Christ conferred by the hands of his disciples, Ioh. 4. 2. was not necessa-

selues then agree with vs and with the truth: and to that end build an imaginarie lodging for little children that die without Baptisme, which they call the *Limbus of little children*, forged by mens braines without the word of God: where they say those poore children lie in eternall darknesse, in a hole or caue vnder the earth, deprived of Gods sight, and of eternall saluation, without dolour and torment, and by consequence without griefe; for perpetuall griefe and sorrow for the losse of our soueraigne good, is a perpetuall torment: and if without griefe to be excluded from the presence of God, then also without knowledge of God, and without the loue of God, which is the greatest euill that can be in a reasonable creature.

This Limbus is a field fit to exercise the subtiltie of these Doctors, and a subiect to be disputed of when men are fasting, to know what the soules of those little children do in that prison vnder ground, seeing that there they haue no communication with God, nor with the Saints in Paradise, nor any remembrance of those things which they saw and heard vpon earth, because there they neither saw nor heard any thing. As also whether those children shall rise againe at the latter day: whether they shall appeare before the iudgement seate of Christ: what sentence the Iudge will giue; and how they can heare or comprehend that sentence. Whether they shall remaine still in that caue vnder the ground then when the earth shall be no more, or whether the Pope hath appointed them any other lodging. To what end their eyes and their eares shall serue them in that Limbus after their resurrection: Whether the Pope can draw them from thence by Indulgences, as well as Pope *Gregorius* 1. drew the Emperour *Traian* (a Pagan) soule out of hell, if we beleue our aduersaries. When that horrible custome began which is vsed in the Hospitall of Paris, where they throw little children that are dead without Baptisme into a deepe well, as vnworthy of any buriall. And lastly, whether that any one euer came from that Limbus to bring them that newes, seeing that God neuer shewed vs of any such thing.

*A deciding of this difference by the holy
Scriptures.*

1 The Scripture draweth vs out of this difficultie, *Genesis 20. Sell.*
17.7. where God saith to *Abraham, I will be thy God, and of
thy seed after thee.* Now children that died before circumci-
sion cannot be excluded from *Abrahams* posteritie. Then God
is also their God, and by consequence they are inheritors of
eternall life. *For God is not the God of the dead, but of the living.*
So saith Iesus Christ, *Matth. 22. 32.* And *Acts 2. 39.* Saint
Peter saith to the Iewes that were converted to the faith of
Christ, *For the promise is made to you, and to your children.*
Where speaking of children in generall, he also comprehen-
deth as well those that are new borne, as those that had re-
ceiued Baptisme. Then if God (without exception) decla-
reth himselfe to be the God of the children of the faithfull,
and acknowledgeth them to be his, and if to them the pro-
mise and the covenant of God belongeth, is it not a rash
iudgement, and an iniurious crueltie against the goodnesse of
God, to condemne them to eternall damnation?

2 The Apostle Saint *Paul*, *1. Cor. 7. 14.* speaking of a man
and a wife, wherof the one is an infidell, the other a Christi-
an, and of children borne in that marriage, saith that their
children are holy, *Otherwise (saith he) your children are vn-
cleane, but now they are holy.* If children borne in marriage
where but one of the parties is a Christian, are holy by the
Apostles iudgement, what apparence is there for men to
thinke that those children which are borne of two Christian
parents are not holy? and that they should be excluded from
the grace of God, vnder pretence that they died without Bap-
tisme? Many of our aduersaries to save their honesties, say
that by the word *holy*, is vnderstood children lawfully borne;
and that by *uncleane* children, the Apostle vnderstandeth ba-
stards and children vnlawfully begotten. Thus they play with

*Dist. 26. Can.
Pon. t. m. m.
Iohannes Bap-
tista dum He-
rodem ab in-
cessu prohibe-
ret, dicens:
Non licet tibi
habere uxorem
fratris tui: e-
videnter offen-
dit inter ius-
tos coniugia
esse.*

the Scriptures, and contradict themselves. For the Church of Rome is of opinion with vs, that Marriages betweene Pagans are lawfull, and their children legitimate. Saint *Iohn Baptist* said to *Herod*, That it was not lawfull for him to haue his brother *Philips* wife, Mat. 14. 4. Then he esteemed that the marriage betweene *Philp* and *Herodias* his wife was indissoluble, and consequently lawfull. Ancient Christians acknowledged the Pagan Emperors children to be lawfull successors in the Empire, and obeyed them, which they had not bene bound to do, if they had esteemed Pagans marriages to be vnlawfull. Then if Pagans children are legitimate, and that the Apostle calleth all legitimate children holy, as our aduersaries say, the children of Turkes and Pagans shall be holy. Certainly the Apostles intent was not to shew vs how children are holy in that sence, but to shew vs by what meanes children are consecrated to God. The Scripture also neuer calleth a child holy because it is lawfully begotten, but it is an ordinarie thing in the Scripture to call those persons and those things holy, which are consecrated to God, and dedicated to his seruice. So in the Law every first borne that opened the matrice was holy vnto God. In the same sence the Temple, the vessels, the sacrifices, and the Sabbath day were holy to the Lord. So are children that are borne of Christian parents; whom seeing that God acknowledgeth the to be holy, why should the Church of Rome esteeme them to be prophane, and exclude from the covenant of God? It is true that they are borne in originall sinne: but Saint *Iohn* saith, that the blood of Christ cleanseth vs from all sinne; the vertue of which blood and the efficacie of his death, is not tyed to the water in any such manner, as that when time and meanes faile and are wanting to be baptized, God therefore cannot cause his grace to be felt, and manifest his goodnesse towards the children of the faithfull, borne within the covenant of God.

Hereby *M. Aronux* discourse is confuted, which saith, That children are called holy, because they are lawfully begotten, and issued from an holy marriage. We grant him that in that place the children are called holy, in the same sence that

that in the same place it is said, that the vnbeleeuing husband is sanctified by the woman. For the Apostle thereby teacheth, that the faith and holines of one of the parties, sanctifieth the marriage betwixt the husband and the wife, in such manner & the children borne in that marriage are consecrated to God.

3. Matthew 19. 14. Iesus said, *Suffer the little children to come vnto me, and forbid them not, for to such belongeth the kingdome of heauen.* Those children which were presented vnto him had not as then bene baptizd by him nor by his Apostles, and yet he declared that the kingdome of God belonged vnto them. It is true that it appeareth not whether they were circumcised or no, but that is to little purpose, seeing that our aduersaries say, That circumcision doth not bring a man to the kingdome of heauen. Then baptism was necessary for those children to enter into the kingdome of heauen, if we beleue our aduersaries. Adde hereunto, that Iesus Christ saith not, that the kingdome of heauen belongeth to children that are circumcised, but simply to children. He considereth the Infancie, and not the Circumcision in them.

4 To this purpose those places of Scripture may be alledged, which say, That God neuer punisheth the innocent for the guiltie, and doth not punish the sonne for the fathers sin, if the sonne doth not participate in his fathers sinne. As Ezechiel 18. 20. he saith, *The soule that sinneth, it shall dye: The sonne shall not beare the iniquitie of the father, neither shall the father beare the iniquitie of the sonne.* The Church of Rome sinneth against this rule, when they will haue a child to be for ever excluded from the kingdome of heauen, because his father negligently delayed his baptism. That is, to punish the innocent for the guiltie. The example of Adams sinne, which brought so many euils vpon his posteritie, is not contrary to this rule; for Adam sinned not as a particular man, but as representing all mankind in the roote. For hauing receiued certaine benefits for himselfe and for his posteritie, he lost them for himselfe and for his posteritie. Moreouer, that euill descended from Adam vpon vs by naturall propagation, which no way can be applyed to the wilfull negligence of parents;

in not baptizing their children.

5. If we desire to haue more pertinent examples, the holy Scripture furnisheth vs sufficiently. Euery man knowes that Circumcision was the same to the faithfull in the old Testament, that Baptisme at this day is vnto vs. And yet infinite numbers of people were saued vnder the old Testament without Circumcision, as all the faithfull women, and those which truly repented among the Gentiles.

6. Circumcision was conferred vpon the eight day after the child was borne. In which time of eight dayes a great number of children died, which according to our Aduersaries doctrine must haue bene eternally damned. The goodnesse of God towards all men, specially towards his owne people and those which feare him, bindeth vs to beleue, that if Circumcision had bene necessarie to saluation, God would haue commanded children to haue bene circumcised presently after they were borne. He would not haue excluded millions of soules (borne of faithfull parents, and of *Abrahams* posteritie, and to whom the blessing of God was promised) from his grace, by the delay of eight dayes. For God taketh no pleasure in the destruction of his creatures, much lesse in losing children borne vnder his covenant. If the people of Israel had beleued that which the Church of Rome beleueth, they would haue desired *Moses* to haue had a shorter time limited vnto them for circumcision. And there would haue bene great and extraordinarie lamentations made by the Iewes for those children that died before those eight dayes were expired. And it is manifest that the people of the Church of Rome do not beleue that which they are taught, seeing that the mothers whose children die before they are baptized, are so easily and so soone comforted, and trouble their mindes no more with the eternall perdition of their children.

7. But specially the children of Israel that died in the Deserts are a notable example herein: For those people omitted the vse of Circumcision for the space of forty yeares together, in which time there was about six hundred thousand men

men borne, and that died therein: which great multitude of soules are eternally lost by the iudgement of the Romish Church. And yet those men were they for whom Manna rained downe from heaven, & whom God couered by day with a pillar of a cloud, and lighted by night with a pillar of fire: which offered sacrifices vnto God, and whose sacrifices God did accept: whom without doubt *Moses* would neuer haue suffered to haue bene vncircumcised, if he had beleueed that without circumcision they could not haue bene saued.

8 But what is more contrary to God and to his word, then to make God subiect vnto men, yea, and that he should be subiect to the will of his enemies, in such manner that he openeth and shutteth the entrie into Paradise at their pleasure? And yet that is the beleefe of the Church of Rome. For Pope *Nicolas* * the first defined, that Baptisme conferred by a Jew or a Pagan is good and auailable, so that the same Jew or Pagan did baptize in the name of the Trinitie, or onely in the name of Iesus Christ. By this meanes, if either a Pagan or a Turke hath a Christian child in his keeping, he can saue or lose the soule of that child: and if he will baptize that child, it shall be saued; but if he will not, that child dying, is presently cast headlong into eternall darknesse. By this reason the saluation of a Christian child dependeth vpon the will of a Turke or a Pagan, of whom it is to be beleueed, that he doth conferre baptisme no otherwise then for a mockerie or in despite.

* *De Consecratione, Dist. 4. Can. A quodam Iudeo, nescitis ritum Christiano aut Pagano, multis in patria vestra baptizatos asserimus. & quid sit in de agendum consulis, &c.*

9 The like absurdities rise from the baptisme of Midwives, who receiuing a child that dieth in the birth, must haue the saluation of the child in their powers. By this reckoning the Apostles with all their miracles, and with all their wisdom and doctrine, neuer did more good to any man then such a Pagan or such a woman do vnto a child which without them had died without baptisme.

10 But is it not an easie matter for a Jew or a Turke hypocritically to cause himselfe to be baptized? Do we thinke or imagine that the same Jew or Turke shall be more acceptable vnto God for prophaning the sacrament of his Couenant and that dying thereupon, he goes straight into Paradise?

An.

*An examination of that which our Aduersaries
produce out of the Scriptures for the ab-
solute necessitie of Baptisme.*

21. Sect.

M. Armin, to proue that no man can be saued without baptisme with water, alledgeth the third and fift verses of the third Chapter of *S. Iohn*, where Iesus Christ saith to *Nicodemus*, *Verily verily I say vnto thee, except a man be borne againe, he cannot see the kingdom of heauen. And, Except a man be borne of Water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God. And verse 7. Thou must be borne againe.* But our Aduersaries seruing their turnes with these places, ouerthrow that which they haue set vp. For the Church of Rome is of opinion, that this place doth not proue the absolute necessitie of baptisme with water to all persons: seeing it saith, that Martyrs may be saued without baptisme with water; and that those which haue vowed to be baptized, and haue not had conuenient time and meanes thereunto, may be saued without it; and those also that are sanctified by the holy Ghost, as we haue already declared. All these then may be saued without being baptized with water. And which is more, although our Lord Iesus Christ spake vnto *Nicodemus*, yet our Aduersaries say, that baptisme with water was not necessarie for *Nicodemus*, because he was circumcised; and that the baptisme of Christ was not necessarie to saluation vntill after his resurrection, as we haue shewed before. Aboue all things, it is to be considered, that Christ did not onely speake to *Nicodemus*, but also for *Nicodemus*, which spake of himselfe and in respect of himselfe when he said, *How can a man be borne againe when he is old?* By this is discovered the nature of error, which is, to interrupt it selfe, and to vndo that which it hath done. For it is euident, that the Lord spake of a new birth, without which *Nicodemus* could not be saued. But our aduersaries say that *Nicodemus* might

might be saved without baptism, because he was circumcised. How should a man beleue these Doctors, seeing they beleue not themselves? and hauing set downe a generall rule to proue that no man can be saved without baptism with water, presently after they breake that rule by a multitude of exceptions? The sence of this place is cleare, Iesus Christ spake to *Nicodemus*, and in him to all those persons that are capable of instruction, and sheweth them that they cannot enter into the kingdome of heauen if they be not borne againe in newnesse of life, and regenerated by the holy Ghost: whose grace being infused into our hearts, is a baptism without the which no man can be saved. And it is most certaine that this rule can beare no exception. For as in *Matth. 3. 11.* it is said, that *Iesus Christ baptizeth vs with the holy Ghost and with fire*, vnderstanding thereby the Spirit mouing and purifying our hearts: so in this place Iesus Christ saith, that to enter into the kingdome of heauen, *We must be borne againe of water and of the spirit*; vnderstanding thereby, a *spirituall washing*, or the Spirit washing and purifying the heart. The words *to be borne againe*, can receiue no other exposition. For, *to be borne againe*, doth not signifie to be baptized with water, but to be renewed and regenerated in a new life by the Spirit of God. And Iesus Christ plainly sheweth, that he speaketh onely of the efficacie of the Spirit secretly working in our hearts, when (verse the eight) he addeth and saith, *The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh, and whither it goeth; so is every man that is borne of the Spirit*. Then to be borne of water and of the Spirit, by our Sauour Christs owne exposition, is to be borne simply of the Spirit: and this comparison of the winde blowing invisibly cannot agree with any thing but onely with the Spirit of God.

Yet to gratifie our aduersaries, let vs grant them that Iesus Christ in this place would say, that without the Sacrament of Baptisme with water, we cannot enter into the kingdome of heauen; why should they not herein vse the same equitie of iudgement, and the same discretion which they vse in the

exposition of those places wherein they say that Iesus Christ speaketh of the necessitie of the Eucharist? In Ioh. 6. 53. Iesus Christ saith, *Except you eat the flesh of the Sonne of man, and drinke his blood, ye have no life in you.* There our aduersaries restraints Christs words to persons that are of the age of discretion, and that are capable of instruction, and that haue meanes to participate the Eucharist. Then let vs say the same in this place, that is, that Iesus Christ speaketh to men that haue attained to yeares of instruction, and to those that haue meanes to be baptized, which cannot be saued if they despise baptism. By this meanes our disputation would be at an end, and we should be at agreement with our aduersaries touching the necessitie of baptism. And that is it which the Maister of Sentences acknowledgeth, saying, *That the same place ought to be understood of those onely that may be baptized; and despise baptism.*

*Lomb. lib. 4.
Sententiarum.
Dist. 4. lit. c.
illud intelli-
gendum est de
illis qui pos-
sunt & con-
temnunt bap-
tizari.*

The marriage of pride with superstition hath begotten this error. For pride seeketh to exalt the necessitie of the ministerie of men, and to perswade that the grace of God necessarily passeth through their hands. And superstition alwaies layeth hold vpon the exteriour action, as if God did nothing without it.

But in the meane time, while the Church of Rome exalteth the necessitie of baptism, it imbaseth the worthinesse thereof, perswading those that beleue her, that the benefit of Iesus Christ is in such sort applyed vnto them thereby, that by the same they are not exempted from satisfying Gods iustice for the punishments and paines of sins by them committed after baptism. They haue abridged the benefit of Iesus Christ, to make way for their trade. They say, that it is no reason that the benefit of the Redeemer should as equally exempt those from punishment which haue wittingly sinned after baptism, as those that sinned by ignorance before baptism. But may it not fall out, that a man may sinne willingly before baptism, and ignorantly after baptism? Then why shall sinne which is wittingly committed before baptism be remitted without any satisfaction: and that which is committed

mitted by ignorance after baptisme, not be remitted without satisfactorie punishments imposed vpon it by God?

The Church of Rome also hath embased baptisme, by permitting women and Pagans to administer the same; whereas Confirmation is onely conferred by the Bishop: as also by adding thereunto spittle, salt, and blowing into the eares of those that are baptized: and by baptizing bels and gallies, as if they condemned baptisme to the gallies.

And in like manner the booke of sacred Ceremonies, lib. 1. cap. 8. in the seventh Section saith, that the Pope baptizeth Lambes made of waxe.

* *Omnibus
baptizatus per
Pontificem.*
¶

THE XXXVI. ARTICLE:

Of the Confession of faith.

We confesse, that the holy Supper, which is the second Sacrament, is a witnesse vnto vs of the vnion that we haue with Iesus Christ, because he not onely died and rose againe for vs, but also truly feedeth and nourisheth vs with his flesh and with his blood, that we may be one with him, and that his life may be common vnto vs. And although that he is in heauen vntill such time as he commeth to iudge all the world, yet we beleeeue, that by the secret and incomprehensible vertue of his Spirit, he nourisheth and quickeneth vs by the substance of his bodie and of his blood. We say that the same is done spirituallly, and place not Imagination and Thought in stead of Effect and Truth. But for that this mysterie farre surmounteth the measure of our senses, and all order of nature, as also because it is celestially, it cannot be apprehended but by faith.

THE

THE XXXVII. ARTICLE.

We belecue (as it hath bene said) that both in the Supper and in Baptisme, God really and effectually giueth vs that which by them he representeth. And therefore with the signes we ioine the true possession and enioying of that which is there presented vnto vs. And for this cause all those which come to the sacred table of Iesus Christ with a pure faith, like vnto a vessell, truly receiue that which the signes testifie vnto them, that is, that the body and the blood of Iesus Christ are no lesse nourishing to the soule, then the bread and the wine are vnto the body.

THE XXXVIII. ARTICLE.

So we say, that water being a weake element, doth testifie the truth of the interior washing of our soules in the blood of Iesus Christ, by the efficacy of his Spirit; and that the bread and the wine being giuen vnto vs in the Supper, truly serue vs for spirituall food, because they shew vs as it were to the eye, that the flesh of Iesus Christ is our meate, and his blood our drinke. And we reiect all fantastical persons and Sacramentaries, that will not receiue such signes and markes, seeing that our Lord Iesus Christ with his owne mouth pronounceth and saith, *This is my body*, and *This cup is my blood*.

Of these three Articles, which comprehend the beleefe of
our

our Churches touching the holy Supper. *M. Arnoy* onely layeth hold on the last, and discourseth in this manner.

ARNOY.

*Of there all union of the faithfull with Iesus Christ,
and of the eating and participation
of his body.*

All this Article excludeth the truth and reality of the body and the blood (to serve us with the onely figure, whereby we are holden under the Jewish elements, and shadows without bodies.) And although that some Ministers of the later times, being Calvins disciples, by his example have induced by a subtil method the invention to speake as we do, saying, that the body of Christ substantially, and not onely in effect, is given and united to the faithfull in the Supper, yet when they are pressed to make answer, whether the bodie of Christ is locally present in the signes, they say, no, and that it be as distant from them, as heauen is from the earth: from whence ensueth manifest contradiction, and the abuse is discovered by this Syllogisme.

It is impossible that two substances distant one from the other as heauen from the earth, should be entirely and substantially coniuncted one with the other.

But the body of the Sonne of God is distant from the signes, especially of bread and wine, as heauen is from the earth.

Ergo it cannot be entirely and substantially coniuncted to the body of those that receive the signes thereof. Therefore it is vainly said of them (so abuses the world) that the bodie is substantially given; seeing that by their Article it is said, that the bread and the wine are given to shew as it were to the eye, that the bodie and the blood are our nourishment.

MOYLE.

If I would simply follow the steps of this Doctor, and content my selfe to confute him, this worke would be very slender and of small instruction. For therein he neither compre-
hends.



hends our beleefe nor his owne, and doth as much contradict his owne as our Church, and obserueth neither order, consequence, nor sence in his discourse.

He maketh vs say that we exclude the truth of the body of Christ, and are content with the figure onely, which is cleane contrary to that which we beleefe. While the signes are present before our eyes, and in our mouthes, Iesus Christ is present to our faith, and really giuen to our soules: by a contract made, as by a Kings letters pattents an house or an inheritance may be really giuen vnto vs, although it be farre from vs. The Sunne ioyneth really with our sight, although it be in heauen and we here on earth. The head is really ioyned with the feete by meanes of the soule, which maketh them to be all of one body, although their posture in their body be far asunder. The husband is really one body and one flesh with his wife, although they be absent one from the other. If reall and substantiall vnions are found to be in naturall things distant by place one from another, how much more in diuine things? Cannot Iesus Christ really loyne himselfe to our soules, and by our soules to our bodies, by the meanes of his Spirit dwelling in our bodies? Cannot he come to vs, without suffering himselfe to be deuoured by his enemies, gnawed with mens teeth, and to be inclosed in a wafer, which may be carried away by a beast? The Scripture saith, that we are one bodie with Iesus Christ, and that he is the head and we the members; which vnion I thinke our aduersaries will not call imaginarie and figuratiue; they rather acknowledge it to be reall and true: and yet this vnion is as well without the Eucharist as in the Eucharist. For they are constrained to retaine the words, although they are ignorant of the thing it selfe, and strue against the fruite and vertue thereof: and with carnall spirits cannot conceiue any other reall vnion with the bodie of Iesus Christ, then that which is made by eating, as if Iesus Christ were made for the belly, and not for the consciences of men: or as if it were not the priuiledge of the children of God, to be really conioyned with the Sonne of God: for they make the wicked and hypocrites also to eate Iesus Christ,
and

and really to participate his body; thinking that the dead can eate the bread of life; and that the enemies of God can be really ioyned with the Sonne of God: esteeming the reall eating with the mouth, to be a much more excellent thing then that which is done by faith: although the eating by the mouth is common both to the good and to the bad, but that which is by faith, is proper to the faithfull: and that the eating with the mouth without eating by faith, is hurtfull, and turneth to condemnation, but the eating by faith is alwaies profitable, and necessary to saluation.

Some spirits grossly subtil mocke at the spirituall vnion of Iesus Christ with vs, as if it were a meere imagination, and say that by the same reason the Spirit of Christ should be substantially vnited with all creatures, because he is in all places: which they speake without reason; for although the Spirit of God is in every place and in all creatures, yet he is not vnited with euery one of them: there is nothing but the soule that is capable of that vnion. As in naturall formes, it is one thing to assist, another thing to giue forme or shape: so in the Spirit of Christ, it is one thing to be present with any thing, and another thing to vnite it selfe thereunto to quicken and to sanctifie it. *But he that is ioyned vnto the Lord* (saith the Apostle, 1. Cor. 6. 17.) *is made one spirit with him.* So by the vnion of the Spirit of Iesus Christ with our spirits, his body also is made one body with ours, as when the two extreme linkes of a chaine are ioyned together by a thrid.

M. Arnon argues no better when he maketh vs to say, that in the Supper the body of Iesus Christ is giuen in substance, and not onely by effect; as if to giue Iesus Christ in substance, and to giue him effectually, were not all one thing. He speaketh as if I should say, that such a man was not onely beheaded, but also that he had his head cut off.

It likewise appeareth, that he vnderstandeth not his owne beleefe, when he disliketh that we belecue not that Iesus Christ is locally present in the signes of bread and wine: for the Church of Rome doth not beleue it no more then we.

The Syllogisme which he frameth is not a Syllogisme, for the conclusion is composed of diuers peeces which are not found in the propositions. In neither of the propositions is there a word of *the body of those that receive the signes*. Now nothing ought to be in the conclusion which is not found in the propositions.

It is one thing to speake of the vnion of the body of Iesus Christ with the signes, and another thing to speake of the vnion of the body of Iesus Christ with our soules, and by our soules with our bodies. The signes are ioyned with Iesus Christ by sacramentall vnion, as the water in Baptisme is ioyned with the blood of Iesus Christ. But the body of Iesus Christ is vnited to our soules by a reall and spirituall vnion.

He goeth on with his argument, and glosseth vpon the places of Scripture by vs noted in the margent of our Confession.

ARNOVX.

*Of the Reall presence of the body of Christ in the Supper,
and of Transubstantiation.*

23. *Scilicet.*

Places noted in the margent of the Confession. Iohn 6. 31. Our Fathers did eate manna in the desert, as it is written, he gaue them bread from heauen to eate. 1. Cor. 11. 23. 24. Iesus tooke bread, and when he had giuen thanks, he brake it, and said, Take, eate, this is my body which is broken for you, do this in remembrance of me. Matih. 26. 26. And as they did eate, Iesus tooke the bread, and when he had blessed it, he brake it, and gaue it to his disciples, and said, Take, eate, this is my body.

In all these places is there any direct place by the which it is said, that the figure onely is giuen vnto vs, that the bread and the wine are giuen vs for food, and that the bread and the wine shew vs (as it were to the eyes) the flesh and the blood? I will go a little further, where are those direct words in a matter of so great consequence? and with what face can all the Administrers in the world
suffer

suffer and endure the reproch of the Sonne of God, when at the day of iudgement of the whole world he shall say vnto them, I haue taught by foure of my unreprocheable registers, and those of whom you made great account, what I said from my owne mouth at the institution of the Sacrament of loue and vniou: that is; This is my body, this is my blood; and my Church in so many ages hath beleened it, and you vpon your owne credits quarelled with my Church, and said, that I would haue said, This is bread, this is wine, this sheweth my flesh, this sheweth my blood. Why haue you made a signe of that which I haue giuen in truth? and what hurt could it haue bene vnto you, to suffer the world to beleene my word barely and simply vnderstood, in a thing which I could not propound by equivocation or in a double sence, without incurring the blame of falsehood?

Contrary places of Scripture. Iohn 6. 55. 56. My flesh is meate indeed, and my blood is drinke indeed; he that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me and I in him. Nothing can be said more expressely, and I cannot imagine any more expresse gloss then this text of it selfe is, without any consequence or figure.

MOVLIN.

The point of the holy Supper, wherein the truth is more cleare then in any other, is that which Satan hath most wrapped in obscuritie; and of a band of vnitie, hath made it the seed of discord; and of an ayde and meanes to lift vp our faith to Iesus Christ, hath inuented a meanes to pull downe Iesus Christ, and to put him into mans power.

We haue spoken of this matter in a booke expressely made for the same purpose, which as yet hath not bene answered. Here I will say as much as shall suffice to cleare this difference, and to defend the truth contained in our Confession of the faith.

The beleefe of both parties.

The Church of Rome * is of opinion, that presently after
H h 2

24 Se^U. H.
* Concil. Trid.
these Sess. 13.

these words, *Hoc est enim corpus meum*, are pronounced; the substance of the bread changeth into the body of our Lord by transubstantiation; and the substance of the wine into the blood of our Lord. In such manner neuertheless, that by concomitance the body also is whole in euery drop of the wine in the cup, as the body is whole in euery crum and vnder euery part of the Host: which is done by vertue of the words, which being pronounced as well ouer the substance of the bread as ouer the accidents, do not worke but vpon the substance, so that the accidents remaine without a subiect. Not that the body of Iesus Christ which sitteth at the right hand of God cometh into the host, but it is made there by transubstantiation.

a Concil.

Trid. Sess. 7.
can. 11.

b Extra. de es-
lebr. Miss. Tit.
41. cap. De ho-
mine. §. Pe-
tes.

c Platina in
Leone 3. lo-

docus Coccini.
Matthæi Pa-

tri an. 1247.
pag. 713.

d Durand.
Ration. lib. 4.

cap. 35. & In-
nocent. 3. lib.

3. de Myster.
Misse cap. 1.

Canon Peni-
tentialiu 39.

Quando mihi
comedit vel

corrodit cor-
pus Christi.

e Cautela

Missa Species distinguantur, & reuerentur sumanter, & vomitus comburatur, &c.

Vpon condition neuertheless, ^a that the Priest must haue an intent to consecrate. For without that the consecration is not made: and yet in the meane time the people out of a pious and an holy presupposition do not cease to adore the host at all aduentures. *Bellarmino* in the seuen and twentieth Chapter of his first booke of Sacraments ^b saith, Suppose that it sufficeth that the Priest hath an intent to do as the Church of Geneva doth.

To confirme this transubstantiation and ^c reall presence, our aduersaries produce diuers miracles, wherein the host (as they say) being prickt hath shed great drops of blood, and in some of them the host appeared like a little child, entring into mens mouthes: ^d and say, that certaine shepheards ha- uing pronounced the words of consecration vpon their bread being at breakfast, changed all the bread into flesh.

And because many inconueniences happen, either that the consecrated cup may freeze, or that the consecrated host may be stolen, or is eaten by mice, or vomited vp againe by weaknesse of body, the penitentiall Canons, and ^e the Cauteles of the Masse haue ordained certaine rules for euery one of these inconueniences, and say, that it is not to be

thought

thought a strange matter, that rats or dogges may eate the whole body of Iesus Christ now when he sitteth at the right hand of God in his glory, seeing that while he was in his infirmities here on earth the fleas might sucke the drops of his blood, and dogs might licke vp his blood that fell downe from the crosse.

By this doctrine the Priest may do that which all the Angels and Saints together cannot do; for he can make Iesus Christ; and hauing made God by certaine words, he hath God in his owne power. From thence proceedeth their manner of speaking, to lift vp God, to eate him, and to receiue their Creator. From thence proceedeth this prodigious doctrine, that a Priest may transubstantiate whole vessels of wine, and change all the bread in the marker into flesh. From thence proceedeth the adoration of the host in the Priests hands, but not after it is gone downe into his stomacke, although it be present there as well as in the host.

To shew in what manner the body of our Lord is in the Eucharist, they say, that his body is there, but not corporally; and that his body is there, but spiritually, with as much reason as if they said, that a spirit is present corporally. They likewise say, that he is in that place, but not locally; that he is visible vnder the *species*, and yet that the *species* hinder vs from the sight of him: that he is there in length without extention: that he is a body without a locall place; that in euery part of the host he hath his greatnesse, and that in euery crum of the bread he hath his full magnitude as he had vpon the crosse: that he hath two eyes in one selfe same point: that he cannot moue nor breathe vnder the host: that he is whole in heauen, and whole in earth, and yet not in the region betweene both, nor separated from himselfe: that in the host, there is *quantitas*, & *nihil quantum*, length and nothing that is long, saueur and nothing that saueureth, whitenesse and nothing that is white. This is it which they call the accidents without subiect. This is the diuinitie of this age.

It is one of the greatest graces which God hath shewed vnto vs, that we are freed from so strong an error, and that

Toletus de In-
struct. sacerdot.
lib. 2. cap. 28.
Posses conse-
crare sa-
cerdos mul-
tos cophinos
panis & vini
dolum si pra-
sentia ista ha-
beret.

Innocentius 3.
l. 4. de myster.
Misse, cap. 2.
Est enim hic
color & sapor,
quantitas &
qualitas cum
nihil alteratur
sit coloratum
aut sapidum,
aut quantum,
aut quale.

in our Churches they speake not of making of God by certaine words, nor of adoring Iesus Christ made by mens hands: as also that we beleue in one Iesus Christ, which is very man, and hath a true humane body, and who by this meanes is our brother by his conformitie with our nature, and by the vniou of his Spirit, who being ascended vp into heauen, will come againe vnto vs the second time, at the latter day.

Touching the holy Supper, we beleue with the Apostle, 1. Cor. 11. 26. that we eate bread to shew forth the death of the Lord. And 1. Cor. 10. 16. That *the bread which we breake is the communion of the body of Christ*. Which bread is called the body of our Lord, because it is the commemoration thereof, as Iesus Christ addeth to expound his meaning, according to the manner of the holy Scripture, which is, to giue the signes the names of those things which they signifie. Not that we beleue that those signes are onely bare figures bereft of all truth, but with the Apostle we beleue, that breaking that bread we communicate in the body of Christ. Those signes are not onely significatiue, but also exhibitue of Iesus Christ and of his benefits. For although Iesus Christ is not inclosed in that bread, yet is he truly made ours, if with true faith and loue of God we participate of this holy Sacrament, and put all our trust and confidence in the death of Iesus Christ. Therefore we do not adore the Sacrament, but Iesus Christ which is in heauen: taking the Apostles for an example, who did not adore the host in the holy Supper, as also Iesus Christ neither commanded them to adore it, nor vsed any eleuation.

*A prooofe of the doctrine of our Churches by the words
of the institution of this Sacrament.*

Our Lord Iesus Christ after the last Paschall lambe celebrated with his disciples, instituted another Sacrament, which Saint *Paul* calleth the Supper of the Lord, at the which
he

he will haue bread to be broken and eaten by the faithfull, and a cup with wine distributed in remembrance of him, and to declare his death till he comes againe. This institution is found in Saint Matth. 26. in Saint Marke 14. in Saint Luke 22. and 1. Cor 11. From these places, not by peecemeale as our aduersaries do, but wholly and compared together, the truth ought to be drawne.

Saint Matthew saith, *That Iesus Christ tooke the bread, and when he had blessed it, he brake it, and gaue it to his disciples; and said, Take, eate, this is my body*, Saint Luke saith, *that he added, Which is giuen for you; do this in remembrance of me*. And S. Paul in stead of saying, *Which is giuen for you*, saith, *Which is broken for you*. The holy Ghost which guided the hands and the spirits of the Apostles and of the Euangelists, vsed that diuersitie, that it might serue for a declaration and opening of the truth, and to the end that one Euangelist should serue to make the other to be vnderstood.

All the words of the Euangelists are true, not onely taken all together, but seuerally. Then let vs first examine them seuerally and apart, and after that all together.

1 I say that the Gospell witnesseth, that Iesus Christ *tooke bread, that he blessed it, and that he brake it*. Then seeing that Iesus Christ tooke, and brake bread, how comes it that in the Church of Rome they say, that the Priest doth not breake bread? and that it is no more bread when the braking of the Sacrament is made?

2 The Gospell saith, that Iesus Christ *tooke bread, that he brake it, and that he gaue it*. Then it is true that he gaue bread, contrary to the Romish Church, which saith, that in the Masse the Priest giueth no bread. And note these words, *That Iesus Christ gaue bread*; which is not giuen but after consecration; it is bread therefore still after consecration.

3 And Saint Matthew witnesseth, that Iesus Christ *tooke bread, blessed it, brake it, and gaue it to his disciples, and said, Take, eate, this is my body*. Therefore we must beleue, that the bread which Iesus Christ brake, and gaue, was his body, and not as the Church of Rome, which beleueth that

It is no more bread, but onely the body of Iesus Christ, made by the conuersion of bread. He that will not be culpable of changing the words of the Gospell, ought constantly to hold these two truths set downe in the Gospell: the one, that Iesus Christ gaue bread; the other, that that bread which he gaue was his body: and must not do as the Church of Rome doth, which vnder a pretence to lay hold on the second truth, ouerthroweth the first, and imagineth a transubstantiation whereby the bread is abolished.

4 These onely words, *This is my body*, whereon they build their doctrine, cannot beare vp the frame of Transubstantiation. For they are declaratiue words of that which is, and not effectiue of that which is not, and which presuppose that the same bread was alreadye the bodie of the Lord before he pronounced these words.

5 And indeed both we and our aduersaries agree, that the bread is made the body of Christ by consecration, but consecration is not made by these words *This is my body*, but by prayer and blessing which went before, as the Canon of the Church of Rome acknowledgeth, which beginneth *Corpus* * in the second Distinction of Consecration, and saith, *We call this the body and bloud of Christ; which being taken from the fruits of the earth, and consecrated by mysticall prayer, is directly taken by vs for spirituall saluation, in memorie of the passion of our Lord.* And Pope Innocent the third in the fourth booke of the Mysteries of the Masse, cap. 6. saith, That Iesus Christ did not consecrate by these words, *This is my body*; but that he consecrated by his diuine vertue before he vttered those words. And * certainly reason confirmeth it: for we must be voyde of sense, if we know not, that to consecrate bread to God, we ought rather to speake to God then to the bread. But our aduersaries had rather go against reason, their owne Popes, and their Decrees, then obey the Gospell, placing consecration in these words, *This is my body*, by which the Priest speaks not to God but to the bread.

6 Moreouer, no man can denie, that when Iesus Christ said, *This is my body*, but by that word *This*, he vnderstood that

* *Corpus & sanguinem Christi dicimus illud quod de fructibus terra acceptis & precem mysticam sanctificationis ecclesie sumimus ad salutem spirituales in memoriam Domine passionis.*

* Reade the booke of Capitefontium, which in the Preface saith, that Innocent and Catherinus and Gabriel Biel, and the ancient Fathers, are of opinion that consecration is made by prayer.

that which he held in his hands. Now both we and our aduersaries acknowledge, that when Iesus Christ pronounced the word *this*, he held nothing but bread in his hands. It followeth then that by the word *this*, he vnderstood that bread: and by consequence that these words, *This is my body*, signifie *This bread is my body*, and not *Vnder these species is my body*. Nor *this shall be transubstantiated into my body*, as our aduersaries vnderstand it. The Decretall of the Romish Church saith as we say, that, *Panis est corpus Christi*, the bread is the body of Christ. *That which is seene* (saith the Canon) *is bread and a cup, as our eyes witnesse. But touching the instruction which faith requireth, the bread is the body of Christ.*

7 Sith therefore the sence of these words; *This is my body*, is, *This bread is my body*, we must know how this bread can be the body of Iesus Christ. Which he himselfe declareth in all the words that follow, which we will particularly list and examine.

8 Iesus Christ (as the Apostle Saint Paul saith) hauing said, *This is my body*, addeth, *Which is broken for you.*

The bread of the holy Supper must needs be the body of Christ in the same manner that the body of Christ is broken in the holy Supper. But he is not therein really broken; for it is impossible: onely there he is sacramentally broken: therefore in like sort the bread is not really the body of Christ, but sacramentally, and as the signes ordinarily take the names of the things by them signified; in the same manner as in the line following, the cup is called a Testament; as circumcision is called the couenant of God, Gen. 17. 9. 10. As the Paschall Lambe is called the passeouer, Exod. 12. 11. and 11. 2. and 2. Chro. 30. 15. &c. As the Arke is called the Eternall, 1. Sam. 6. 2. and Psalme 24. because it was a signe of the fauourable presence of God amongst his people. As the Apostle, 1. Cor. 10. 4. saith, that *the rocke was Christ*, because it was a figure of Iesus Christ. The Scripture is full of such examples: it is the ordinary stile thereof, to giue vnto the signes the names of those things which they represent. And reason also alloweth it; for what is more naturall and proper, then in sacraments to vse sacramentall

2. De consecr.
Can. Qui man-
ducant. Quod
videtur panis
est & calice,
quod etiam
oculi remun-
tiant, quod
autem fides
postulat in-
struenda, pa-
nis est corpus
Christi.

cramentall words, and in an action which is figurative, to vse a figure conformable to the action? to the end that by calling the signes by the names of those things which they signifie, we may apprehend the vnion which the signe hath with the thing signified? because God all at one time representeth the signes vnto our eyes, and the thing signified vnto our faith.

To say that hereby we open a gap vnto heresies, and thereby fauour the Marcionites, who in like manner might figuratiuely interpret these words of Saint Iohn, *The word was made flesh*, is nothing to the purpose; for Saint Iohn in that place speaketh not of a Sacrament: and therefore the sacramentall manner of speaking agrees not to that place. This impuration may iustly be layd vpon our aduersaries themselves, who to establish their Transubstantiation, wrest and wring all the words of the institution of the Eucharist, and therein induce a dozen vnaccustomed and prodigious figures, as hereafter we shall see.

To returne then to these words, *Which is broken for you*, we must vnderstand that the Romish Churches translation and the text of the Masse, haue corrupted this place, and haue translated that in the future tence which Iesus Christ spake in the present tence, and haue put *shall be broken*, for *is broken*, *frangetur*, for *frangitur*: which translation althoughe it be good touching faith, yet it hindereth men from knowing that the purpose of Iesus Christ is sacramentall, and that the name of the thing signified is attributed to the signe.

¶ Then to make the truth manifest, we aske our aduersaries, whether the body of Iesus Christ be really broken into peeces in the Eucharist? or whether therein it be onely broken sacramentally and significantly in a myserie? If they say it is broken sacramentally, then they are bound to interpret these words in the same manner, *This is my body*, and to say, that that which Iesus Christ gaue to his Disciples was his sacramentall body, and a remembrance of him. But if they will haue the body of our Lord to be really broken in the Masse, thereby they fall into three inconueniences: The first is, that they wrong Iesus Christ, who being impassible,

ble, can no more be broken. The second is, that they contradict their Masse and their Bible, which hath translated, *shall be broken*, in the future tense, because there is no other reall breaking of the body of our Lord but that which was to be done the next day vpon the crosse. The third is, that they contradict themselues: for the Church of Rome beleeueth, that the body of Iesus Christ cannot be broken, and that when the Priest breaketh the host, there is nothing but the accidents that are broken, and that the body of our Lord remaineth whole in euery peece thereof. So that it is a mockerie for them to say, that the body of our Lord is broken vnder the *species*, seeing they say that he remaineth whole vnder the *species*. That which remaineth whole vnder the *species*, is not broken vnder the *species*. Whereby they speake as wisely, as if I should say, that a sword is broken in the scabbard, when the scabbard onely is broken, and the sword is whole and not broken.

Herein they ought to giue glory vnto God, and yeeld to the force of truth, and acknowledge, that seeing the body of Christ cannot be really broken in the Sacrament, that therein it is broken sacramentally, in the same manner that the bread is the body of Christ. This breaking hath relation to that vpon the crosse, and taketh the name of that which it representeth.

10 I say the same of the words which Saint Luke vseth, *This is my body which is giuen for you*. For Iesus Christ did not say, *This is my body which I giue you to eate*: but said, *This is my body which is giuen for you*. Which words, *for you*, are as much as, *for your redemption*; which was really done vpon the crosse, but is sacramentally done in the Supper, and for a remembrance, as Iesus Christ addeth, saying, *Do this in remembrance of me*.

These words decide the question. For if that which Iesus Christ giueth be the remembrance of Iesus Christ, it is not Iesus Christ: nothing is the remembrance of it selfe. And there is nothing so absurd, as that which our aduersaries say, * that in the Eucharist Iesus Christ is the figure and the remembrance

* Bell. lib. 2.
de Euchar.ca.
24. Idem igi-
tur Christus
fuit figura
sui ipsius.

membrance of himselfe; as if one should say, that the king is his picture, and that he is the image of himselfe. It is to no purpose to alledge diuerse respects, and to say, that Iesus Christ in the Masse is the figure of Iesus Christ on the crosse. For whatsoever diuersitie of respects may be alledged, yet the king sitting at the table shall neuer be the figure of himselfe on horsebacke. And if the king himselfe should represent one of his battels, yet he should not be the figure of himselfe, but his present action should be the figure of his action past. Adde hereunto, that visible things may be figures of inuisible things. But here they will haue Iesus Christ (inuisible in the Masse) to be the figure of Iesus Christ on the crosse where he was visible.

* i h p r i s t o t e
q u o t i t u r, q u i d
u e l p e r i n u e l p e
e r i d i c t u r i n
d o u n d r e s l e p
e l d i c t d e q u a
q u o t i t u r.

11 Beside, remembrance is of a thing past or absent, as *Aristotle* saith in his first chapter of the booke of *Memorie and remembrance*. So when the ancient Fathers called the tombes of Martyrs remembrances, they shewed thereby, that those Martyrs were in heauen. And the Manna that was kept in the Arke, was not a remembrance of that portion of Manna that was in the Arke, but of the miraculous feeding of the people in the desert. And whosoever extolleth the valour of a king in his owne presence, doth not renew the remembrance of the kings person that is present, but of his actions past. So to remember God, is to remember his maruellous workes, his promises, or his commandements, The same is to be found in all other examples.

It cannot be denied, that the holy Supper is a commemoration not onely of the person of Iesus Christ, but also of his death, seeing that the Apostle commandeth vs to eate that bread, to shew forth his death. 1. Cor. 11. 26. and Iesus Christ saith, *Do this in remembrance of me.*

Then we haue the exposition of these words, *This is my body*, given vs by Iesus Christ himselfe, that is, that the bread which he gave vs is the remembrance of his body.

12 Whereupon it is necessarie to set downe something, whereby to stop the mouches of those that haue their spirits hardened, and are most resolute to contradict the truth. Then

it

it is to be vnderstood, that the language of the Iewes in the old Testament was the Hebrew tongue which was still called the Hebrew tongue, although it fell from the purity thereof by mixing it with the Syrian tongue. In this Hebrew tongue the word *signifie* or *represent* is not found: but the ancient Hebrew Testament in stead of *signifie* alwayes vseth the word *is*. So *Ioseph* in Genesis 40. 12. interpreting the dreames of *Pharoes* cup-bearer and of his baker, saith, *The three branches of the vine are three dayes*; and in the 18. verse, *The three baskets are three dayes*, that is, *signifie* three dayes: and in the 41. chapter verse 16. *The seven fat kine are seven yeares, and the seven full eares of corne are seven yeares. And the seven leane euill-fauoured kine which came vp after the other, are seven yeares: and the seven emptie eares of corne blasted with the East winde, are seven yeares of famine.* And in foure places of that Chapter the word *are* is put for *signifie* or *represent*. So in *Ezechiel* 37. 11. *These bones are the whole house of Israel*: to shew, that it was represented and figured by those bones. And *Daniel* 2. 38. *It is thou o King that art this head of gold*, in stead of saying, *It is thou that art signified and prefigured by the head of gold.* And 4. 20. 22. *The tree which thou sawest is thou o King.* And 7. 17. *These foure great beasts, are foure kings.* And 21. verse, *The ten barnes are ten kings.* And in the 8. chap. 20. and 21. verses, *The ram which thou sawest hauing two hornes, are the Kings of Media and Persia: and the rough goate is the king of Grecia.* In all these places and many others, the word *are* is as much as to *signifie* or *represent*. From thence it comes, that although the Greeke tongue wanteth no words to say, *signifie*, *figure* or *represent*, yet the new Testament in Greeke, which oftentimes imitateth the Hebrew phrase, ordinarily saith, *is* for *signifieth*. So the Apostle 1. Cor. 10. 4. speaking of the rocke from whence water issued forth in the desert, saith, *that the rocke was Christ*. And Galat. 4. 22. 24. it is said that the bond seruant and the free, that is, *Agar* and *Sara*, are the two couenants: and Apocal. 17. 9. 18. *The seven heads are seven mountaines wherenpon the woman sitteth, and the woman which thou sawest is that great Citie.*

Then

Then because Iesus Christ could not in his language say, *This signifieth or representeth my body*, because these words are not in the Hebrew tongue, he spake as the same language led him, and followed the manner of speaking vsed among the Iewes, and perpetuall in the holy Scripture. But foreseeing that Satan by these words would plant idolatrie in the Church, he added, that that which he did was a remembrance: which is as much as if he had said, *This is the remembrance of my body.*

13 Let vs follow the words of the institution of this Sacrament, and let vs come to the second part, which is the distribution of the wine. Matthew 26. 27. describeth it in these words: *Also he tooke the cup, and when he had giuen thanks, he gaue it them saying, Drinke ye also of it: for this is my blood of the new Testament, that is shed for many for the remission of sinnes.*

Saint Luke that wrote since, setteth downe these words in Chap. 22. 20, in this manner, *This cup is the new Testament in my blood which is shed for you.* Saint Paul saith the same in 1. Cor. 11. 25.

These two pen-men of the Spirit of God, Saint Paul and Saint Luke, which wrote after the rest, serue for expositors, and make a paraphrase of the words of our Lord rehearsed by Saint Matthew. For it is to be presupposed, that he which writeth after another, writeth not to obscure him, but to expound and make him euident. It were a great abuse to make Iesus Christ to be the expounder of Saint Pauls words, seeing that Saint Paul wrote expressly to expound the words of Iesus Christ, to cause the same to be vnderstood.

Our Sauour Iesus Christ hauing said, that *the cup is his blood*, the Apostle Saint Paul teacheth vs in what sence that ought to be taken, that is, *This cup is the new Testament, or the new covenant in his blood.*

These words of Saint Luke and of Saint Paul, *This cup is the new Testament*, or *this cup is a new covenant*, (for the Greeke signifieth both the one and the other) leade vs directly to the knowledge of the truth.

14 For I demand of our aduersaries, whether that which is

in the cup be a couenant sacramentally and in a significant myſterie, or whether they will haue it to be the Teſtament and couenant of God in effect. If that which is in the cup be not really the couenant of God, but in a myſticall ſignification and ſacramentally, we muſt ſay, that that which Ieſus Chriſt brake and put into his diſciples hands, was not really the body of Ieſus Chriſt, but ſacramentally, and in a myſticall ſignification.

But if they will haue that which is in the cup really to be a couenant or a Teſtament, and the blood of Ieſus Chriſt which they pretend to be in the cup to be a Teſtament, thereby they affirme that which themſelues beleue not. 1. For will they haue the wine to be tranſubſtantiated into a couenant, or to become a Teſtament? 2. Can they ſpeake more abſurdly, then to ſay that the blood of Ieſus Chriſt is a couenant or a Teſtament, ſeeing that a couenant and a Teſtament is a relation or an action, but the blood of our Lord is a ſubſtance? 3. A Teſtament conſiſteth in clauſes and promiſes, which agreeth not with the blood of Chriſt. 4. What an abſurditie is it, to call Ieſus Chriſt a Teſtament, ſeeing he is the teſtator, or to call him a couenant, ſeeing the couenant is betweene him and vs? 5. If one of the parties contracting may be called the couenant, the faithful alſo may be called the couenant, becauſe the couenant is contracted with them. 6. If the blood of our Lord be the couenant and Teſtament, the Prieſt (as they ſay) making the blood of Ieſus Chriſt, euery day maketh the couenant of God, and the Teſtament of Ieſus Chriſt. But the couenant of God is no more made, it is eternall, and the Teſtament of the Sonne of God is not reiterable; and to apply the ſame we muſt not make it. 7. Beſides, if the blood of our Lord in the cup be really the new Teſtament, then it followes, that the new Teſtament began at that time, which notwithstanding was before. For before the inſtitution of this Sacrament, the Goſpell was already preached, which beareth this inſcription, *The new Teſtament*. And Baptiſme alſo was then already inſtituted, which is a Sacrament of the new Teſtament. 8. And Saint *Matthew* ſaith, that *That which is in the cup is the blood of the new Teſtament*; then it followeth, that that blood is not the:

the new Testament. For as *Philips* cloake is not *Philip* himselfe, so the blood of the new Testament is not the new Testament it selfe. And yet our aduersaries fully hardened in error, obstinately maintaine that the blood of the Lord which they say is in the cup, is truly and really a couenant, and that the wine is transubstantiated into a couenant.

Howbeit truth is so strong that it makes them say the truth when they thinke not of it. For they say, that the cup is called the couenant, because that by the cup the couenant is confirmed, and that it is the scale thereof; which is the same that we say, and by which we proue that the cup is not the couenant really, but the Sacrament thereof: for the confirmation of a thing is not the thing it selfe, and a scale set vpon a letter is not the letter it selfe. So that against their wils they yeeld vnto vs. For seeing that the cup is called the couenant because it is the scale thereof, by the same reason the bread also must be called the body of Christ because it is the scale and the confirmation thereof, which is our beleefe. For the Sacraments are scales, as *Saint Paul*, *Rom. 4.* calleth circumcision, *The scale of the righteousness of faith*, although in it there was no transubstantiation.

16 And in saying that the cup is the scale of the couenant, they confesse (against their wils,) that the cup is not really the blood of Iesus Christ. For the scales and confirmations of a couenant, and the signatures of a Testament, ought to be visible and exposed vnto our senses: but the blood in the cup is inuisible. For it is not onely hidden vnder the accidents and apparence of wine, but it is also hidden in the body: for our aduersaries say, that the body is in the cup, and that the blood which is in the cup is in the veines of the body in its naturall places.

17 And if these things were not as cleare as the Sunne, yet the words that follow are strong enough to force those that are most obstinate to yeeld, and to make such as are wilfully blind to see the truth. For the Gospell saith, *This cup is the new Testament in my blood.*

These words, in my blood, cleare the point, and manifestly shew,

shew, that that which is in the cup is not really the blood of Iesus Christ. For say that by *this cup*, we must vnderstand *this blood*, and let vs see what will ensue thereof. Is not this to make the words of our Lord ridiculous, to make him say, *This blood is the new Testament in my blood*? What? is that blood of Iesus Christ in the blood of Iesus Christ? Must we by this meanes make two sorts of blood of Iesus Christ, as ** Bellarmine* doth, for feare of putting the blood of Iesus Christ into the blood of Iesus Christ? For it is certaine, that that which is in a thing, whether it be contained therein, whether it be infused therein, or whether it be adherent therin, is not one selfe same thing with that thing. For seeing that the Gospell witnesseth that *Calix est in sanguine Christi*, it saith evidently, that *Calix non est sanguis Christi*: a cup which is in the blood of Christ, is not really the blood of Christ, but sacramentally, and by commemoration, as it is added.

** Bell. lib. 1. de Euchar. cap. 11. §. Ad quartum. Sanguis accipitur duobus modis in his duobus locis.*

18 Our aduersaries charged with so many absurdities, defend themselves by impietie, which casteth them headlong into other absurdities. They say, that there is mention made of two sorts of blood of Iesus Christ, whereof the one is a cup, the other was shed vpon the crosse; whereof the one was powred vpon the other, and whereof the one is the Testament, and the other not. But still it is the same blood. If these seuerall respects should make seuerall bloods of Christ, there would be a thousand sorts of blood, one at the table, another in the ship, and another after the resurrection, &c. And if the blood in the cup hath the honour to be the couenant, why should we deprive the blood of the crosse of that honour? Then to effect this, they must forge two sorts of couenants, and by that meanes creepe among thornes as snakes do, and cover themselves with a thousand wrested deuices against the force of truth.

19 Saint *Matthew* addeth, *This blood*, or as Saint *Luke* and Saint *Paul* say, *This cup is shed for many for the remission of sinnes*.

The vnderstanding of these words depends vpon those that went before; for seeing we haue proued that the Lord giueth

to the signes the names of the things signified, it is agreeable to reason, that as the cup is the bloud of Iesus Christ sacramentally, so it should be shed sacramentally. For you must note, that the Euangelists say, *is shed*, and speake in the present tense, saying *effunditur*, and not *effundetur*, as the Masse and the Romish translation say. For although that this sacramentall shedding of the bloud of Christ for the remission of sins, hath relation to the effusion vpon the crosse, yet we ought to translate the words faithfully. Also the translation in the present tense doth hinder vs from knowing that our Sauours intent was sacramentall, and that the name of the thing signified is attributed to the signe.

Dant. 5. Quocumque.

20 Herein our Aduersaries are much troubled. For if this shedding be sacramentall and a commemoration, we haue wonne our cause: and the Doctors of the Romish Church are on our side, who hauing glossed vpon the Decretall in the 2. Distinction of Consecration, say, *Sanguis effunditur, id est, effundi significatur*, The bloud is shed, that is, it is signified or represented that the bloud is shed. The Masse it selfe also, translating in the future tense *effundetur*, shall be shed, leadeth vs the right way, for it giueth vs to vnderstand, that the effusion which the Lord made in the Sacrament was a signification and a representation of the effusion which was to be made the next day vpon the Crosse.

21 Yet our Aduersaries contend with vs herein, and affirme, that the bloud of Iesus Christ is really and effectually shed in the Eucharist. But if you aske them, whether in the Eucharist the bloud issueth out of the body, or out of the veines, they say, no, and so contradict themselues, and confesse that the bloud is not really shed. They themselues call the Eucharist a Sacrifice without bloud; which should be false if therein bloud were really shed. They also contradict themselues when they say, that the bloud of our Lord stirreth not in the Eucharist, nor moueth, and yet it is shed therein, for all shedding is a mouing.

22 In this perplexitie their onely refuge is, neuer to answer any thing to the purpose. For being asked, whether the

the blood of our Lord is shed in the Masse, they say it is shed vnder the *species*. But we aske them not, vnder what thing the blood is shed, but whether it be shed therein or no. Adde hereunto, that the blood which cometh not out of the bodie vnder the *species*, and which stirreth not from vnder the *species*, is not shed vnder the *species*.

23 They say, that the accidents which they call *species*, are shed, which is a capricious kinde of Philosophie, to imagine that the Priest powreth out lines, taste, and colour of wine without wine, and that the blood is shed without issuing out of the bodie. So that the Priest filleth out and drinketh bones, flesh, and a liquid and potable humane bodie, which is whole in euery drop of the wine.

24 The Lord concludeth his intent by a clause which definitiue decideth the controuersie, saying, *Matth. 26. 29. I say vnto you, I will not drinke henceforth of this fruite of the Vine.* Saint *Marke* saith the like. Our Lord could not more plainly say that it was the fruite of the Vine which he dranke, and not blood. For the fruite of the vine and wine are all one thing. It is true that Saint *Luke* speaketh of two cuppes, one of the paschall Lambe, the other of the holy Supper, and witnesseth also, that Iesus Christ called the cuppe of the paschall Lambe the fruite of the Vine. But Saint *Matthew* and Saint *Marke* speake onely of the cup of the Eucharist, which they call the fruit of the Vine. Surely it cannot be said, that they call the wine of a Cup whereof they speake not at all, the fruit of the Vine. Then to make the Euangelists to agree, we must necessarily say, that Iesus Christ spake twise of the fruite of the Vine, and that administering the cup of the Eucharist, he repeated the same termes. For it were an intollerable boldnes to correct Saint *Matthew* and Saint *Marke* by Saint *Luke*, and to charge them to haue troubled the order and method of our Sauiours words in so important an action, whereat Saint *Matthew* himselfe was present. Pope *Innocent* the third, in the fourth booke of the Mysteries of the Masse, 27. Chapter, acknowledgeth, that Iesus Christ called that the fruite of the Vine which he consecrated in the Cup.

*Quid autem
vinum in sa-
guine conse-
cravit pater ex
eo quod ipse
subiunxit, non
bibam à modo
de genimine,
etc.*

Being put from that, they haue another refuge, and say, that the wine is called the fruite of the Vine in regard that it was so before. As if we should call a man of fiftie yeares of age a child, because once he was a child: and ripe grapes veriuice, because they haue bene so. This is to say that a thing is that which it is not. The examples by them alledged of *Moses* Rod, that was called a Rod after it was changed into a Serpent; and of the water, called water after it was changed into wine, Iohn 2. 9. are to no purpose. For that Serpent had bene a Rod, and that wine had bene water; but the blood of Christ neuer was wine. And that Rod was turned into a Serpent, which it was not before. But here they will haue this wine to be turned into blood, which was so alreadie before the conuersion. Adde hereunto, that such a figure is repugnant to the nature of a Sacrament, which requireth that the name of the thing signified should be giuen vnto the signe, and not that the name of the signe should be giuen to the thing signified. When we call the wine, blood, we speake according to the custome and nature of Sacraments; but when we call the blood of our Lord wine, or the fruite of the Vine, we ouerthrow the nature of the Sacrament, and embase the thing signified; and to shunne a naturall and visuall figure in these words, *This is my bodie*, induce a figure against nature, which is not visuall, in these words, *I will drinke no more of this fruite of the Vine*.

Prooſes thereof by the circumſtances of the action.

26. Sect. 7 All the circumſtances of the action ſpeake for, and fight with vs againſt tranſubſtantiation. For, as Ieſus Chriſt made no liſting vp of the hoſt, ſo he did not command the Apoſtles to worſhip that which he held in his hands; and it is certaine that they ſate at the Table, which is an vnſit action for thoſe that adore. For if at this day any one ſhould do as the Apoſtles then did, he ſhould be held among them to be a prophane

prophane fellow, and a contemner of God. It is to no purpose to say, that the Apostles had Iesus Christ daily with them: for they did neuer eate him, nor swallowed him downe into their stomacks, nor euer were present at such a sacrifice. And such an adoration had bene necessarie in the first institution of that Sacrament, and in the action which was to serue for a patterne and president in time to come.

2 The time also when the Lord celebrated that action is verie necessarie to be considered. For then his bodie was weake and passible, but the bodie which they will haue Iesus Christ to haue giuen to his Disciples, was impassible, and could not be broken, as being whole in euery crumme, and spirituall and indiuisible. And there can no example be found, wherein a bodie is weake and passible in one place, and impassible and without infirmitie in another place. Contrarie things may agree in one selfesame subiect at seuerall times, or in seuerall parts of the subiect, or in diuers respects, that is, being compared to diuers things: As for example a man may be white to day, and the next day blacke; he may be white in one part of his body, and black in another; he may be rich in comparison of one that is poorer, and poore in comparison of one that is richer. But that a man at one and the same time, and all together, not compared to another, can be white and blacke, or poore and rich, it is impossible. Now this is it which they do to the bodie of Christ, which they make, all together, at the same time, and without comparing it to any other, to be mortall and immortall, passible and impassible, weake and without infirmitie, visible and inuisible, speaking and mouing it selfe at the Table, and not speaking nor being able to moue vnder the *species* of bread. Thus you haue two contrary Iesus Christs: and one Iesus Christ more perfect then himselfe: for to be impassible is a perfection, and to be passible is an imperfection.

3 They agree with vs, that Iesus Christ in the Eucharist did eate & drinke with his disciples. Whence it followeth (according to the doctrine of the Church of Rome) that Iesus Christ did eate himselfe, and that he swallowed his whole bo-

die downe into his stomacke. And seeing that naturally Iesus Christs mouth stood in his head, by this doctrine we must say, that at one selfesame time he had his mouth in his head, and his head in his mouth. And yet he did not eate himselfe as he was: for when Iesus Christ did eate, he was weake, and Iesus Christ eaten by Iesus Christ was without infirmities. Which being a greater miracle then the conception and the resurrection of Iesus Christ, yet they can produce no fruite thereby, nor shew vs how that can profit vs touching our redemption. And if Iesus Christ did that to serue for an example to the Priest, then it followeth that the Priest should eate himselfe in the Masse. And it is hard to say, what the body of Iesus Christ did in the body of Iesus Christ, and what efficacie it had therein. And seeing that they say, that the soule is within the host, to what end should Christs soule enter into Christ, seeing it was there already? Do our aduersaries thinke to be beleued in all these things? Is not this the way to paint the house of God with *Chimeras*, and to expose religion to open obloquie?

4 It is also to be noted, that our aduersaries hold, with *S. Augustine* and *Saint Hierome*, that *Iudas* received the Eucharist with the rest of the Apostles. And indeed *Saint Luke* after the administration of the Sacrament, witnesseth that Iesus Christ said, *Behold the band of him that betrayeth me is with me at the table.* But it is manifest, that the bodie of Iesus Christ did not inter into *Iudas*: for the Gospell witnesseth that *Iudas* being at the table, the diuell entred into him. Iesus Christ and the diuell could not well haue lodged both together, seeing that the diuell preuailed in *Iudas*; and so it must follow that the diuell got the vpper hand of Iesus Christ. But Iesus Christ dwelleth not in any man without producing the effects of salvation in him. *Who soener eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood hath life eternall, Ioh. 6. 54.*

5 It is a notable circumstance to be considered, that Iesus Christ celebrating the Eucharist was troubled, as now entering into his passion; and when he arose from the table, he said that his soule was very heavy, even vnto the death, and sweet drops of

of blood for griefe. And yet at one selfesame time our aduersaries make one Iesus Christ to be in the mouthes and stomackes of the Apostles, which being impassible suffered no paine nor griefe, neither sweat drops of blood; which not onely makes two contrary Iesus Christs at one time, but also one Iesus Christ which is not our Sauour, seeing he is exempted from passions.

6 Lastly, it is to be thought, that the bread being broken in so many peeces among the Apostles, some crums or small peeces thereof did fall downe, and that there was some of it left; yet Iesus Christ did not command them to take vp nor to reserue the rest, which he would haue done, if euerie crumme and peece thereof had bene Iesus Christs bodie fully and wholly.

7 But say that there was no bread remaining, yet the Apostles in the meane time that Iesus Christ was vpon the crosse, or in the sepulcher, might among themselues celebrate the Sacrament: and so there should be one Iesus Christ vpon the crosse, with his hands and feete pierced with nayles and tormented, and another not on the crosse, that had not his hands and his feete pierced, neither suffered any torment. And if in the host Iesus Christ is also crucified and whipt, then they must put the crosse, and the executioners, and the whips into the host, or else they must say that he was crucified vnder the host without the crosse, and whipped without whips, which are apparent contradictions.

Other places of Scripture touching this matter.

The onely institution of this holy Sacrament may suffice to ouerthrow their errors, and to confirme and establish the truth: yet you shall see a number of places more out of the Scripture touching this matter; which we will set downe.

1 The Apostle Saint Paul, 1. Cor. 11. 26. hauing declared the institution of the holy Supper, addeth: *For as often as ye*

eate this bread and drinke this cup, ye do shew the Lords death till he come. Wherefore whosoener shall eate this bread, and drinke this cup of the Lords vnworibily, shall be guiltie of the bodie and blond of the Lord. But let a man examine himselfe, and so let him eate of that bread, and drinke of that cup. This excellent Apostle three times in this one place saith, that we eate bread. Now it is not eaten but after consecration. This sheweth then that that which Iesus Christ said to be his bodie, was still bread in the sence and for the reasons aforesaid.

Then I aske our aduersaries, if when the Apostle three times in one place saith, that we eate bread, whether the word bread ought to be taken properly and without a figure, or whether it ought to be taken figuratiuely for the body of Iesus Christ? If it be taken properly, we are satisfied, and so it is bread still after consecration. But if they will affirme that *S. Paul* three times together spake figuratiuely, and that we must expound the figuratiue words of *Saint Paul* by Iesus Christs words, *this is my bodie*, therein they manifestly discouer their vnfaithfull dealing. For they know that Iesus Christ is not an expounder of the Apostles words, but that the Apostles are expositors of Iesus Christs words. Now who ought to speake more clearely, either he that is expounded, or he that expoundeth? He that spake first and briefly, or he that speaketh after him and more at large? Specially considering we see that Iesus Christ in saying, *This is my bodie*, did sufficiently expound himselfe; but *Saint Paul* saying three times one after another, that we eate bread, addeth no exposition. And if by this word *bread* so many times rehearsed by the Apostle we must vnderstand flesh, should not the same Apostle be culpable of holding the people in an error, and of digging a ditch to make them to fall into it? seeing he knew that sence and reason witnesseth that it is bread, whose reports men naturally beleene?

But seeing that our aduersaries turne all things into figures, let vs see how they expound those figures: they will haue the body of our Lord to be called bread, because it was bread before consecration. Which is false, for Christs body neuer was bread.

bread. Besides, it is more convenient to call things by those names which they are, then by those things which they are not any more. And if there be a place or two in the Scripture where that is found, there are thousands that call things that which they are, and not that which they haue bene. 2. Also they say, that Saint *Paul* saith, that *we eate bread*, in stead of saying, that we eate the bodie of Christ, because it seemeth to be bread. That also is false, for the bodie of our Lord neuer seemed to be bread. It is true, that our aduersaries say that the bodie of our Lord is couered ouer with the *species* of bread: but men neuer giue to things that are couered the names of those things which couer them; we call not a scabbard a sword, we neuer say that a man is a chest, although he should be hidden in a Chest.

Neuerthelesse the contempt of this sacred bread redoundeth to the dishonour of Iesus Christ: and as when men tread the kings great seale vnder their seete, the king and not the waxe is dishonoured thereby: so to prophane this bread, is to prophane the Sonne of God: Therefore he which receiueth it vnworthily, receiueth his owne condemnation, because he discerneth not the bodie of our Lord. They would make the Apostle to say, that such a one doth not discern that it is the body of our Lord which he hath eaten: whereas the sence of the Apostles words is, that such an one doth not discern the body of our Lord which he hath wronged and dishonoured.

3. In Acts 2. 46. it is said, that the disciples *did breake bread from house to house*. And Acts 20. 7. *When the disciples came together to breake bread*: which place our aduersaries confesse, is meant of the Sacrament of the Eucharist. They therefore who denie that they did there breake bread, will be wiser then the Apostles, and condemne the words of the Spirit of God, which at this day would be ridiculous. For which of our aduersaries would endure a Priest, that in stead of saying, *I go to sing Masse*, should say, *I go to breake bread*? Here also our aduersaries find another figure, and by the word bread, will haue vs to vnderstand *flesh*.

3 In 1. Corinth. 10. 16. the Apostle saith, *The bread which we breake is it not the communion of the body of Christ?* There also he saith that we breake bread: and it appeareth that by the bread he vnderstandeth true bread, and not the bodie of Christ, because he saith the bread is broken. The bodie of Christ cannot be broken: it is not broken vnder the *species* if it remaineth whole vnder the *species*. Besides he saith, that this bread is the communion of the body of Christ; but the body of Christ is not the communion of the body of Christ. It must then be bread: and when we breake that bread we participate in the bodie of Christ, vnlesse we will giue the Apostle the lye thrice in one line, by saying, that it is no bread but flesh; that this flesh is not broken, and that it is not the communion of the bodie of Christ, but the bodie of Christ it selfe. The communion of the bodie is not without the body, but yet it doth not hence follow, that the communion of the body is the body. In a flame of fire, the brightnes is not without the heate, yet the brightnesse is not the heate.

4 In Acts 3. 21. Saint Peter saith, *Whom the heauen must containe vntill the time of restitution of all things.* The Greeke word sometimes signifieth *containe*, and sometimes *receiue*, but here it cannot be taken for *receiue*. For it is false that the heauen receiueth Iesus Christ vntill the day of iudgement. He hath bene once receiued therein, and there is contained for euer; and if he be contained there, he is no more on earth.

*Significat,
as also capere
in Latine.*

5 Iesus Christ, in Saint Iohn 17. 11. being ready to leaue the world to go vnto his Father, speaketh as being already departed out of the world, saying, *And now I am no more in the world.* And 16. 18. *I leaue the world and go to my Father.* And 12. 8. *For the poore ye haue alwayes with you, but me ye haue not alwayes.* And Iohn 13. 1. he saith, *That his houre was come that he should depart out of this world vnto his Father.* Here Iesus Christ declareth that he is no more in the world, that he leaue the world, and that we should not alwayes haue him with vs. These speeches dislike the Church of Rome, for she will haue vs to haue Iesus Christ alwayes with vs, yea that he should now be much more on earth then he; was when
he

he liued here on earth in his infirmitie: for then he was but in one place at one time, but now they will haue him to be in a thousand places all at one time; and not onely that his bodie should be here among men, but also in the power of men, who keepe it vnder locke and key, for feare of mice, or lest it should be stolen away.

They make answer and say, that in these places Iesus Christ saith that he is not visibly in the world, that he leaueth the world, and that we shall not haue him alwayes as touching his visible presence. This is a kinde of mockerie. For to haue Iesus Christ inuisibly, is alwayes to haue Iesus Christ: and to be alwayes present inuisibly, is not to leaue the world. He lieth that saith he hath no money, because his money is hidden in his pocket; or he that should say that he hath no soule, because his soule is inuisible. He that is in Paris, and hideth himselfe in a place where no man can see him, cannot therefore be said that he is not in Paris.

But there is nothing that more euidently confuteth this euasion, then the promise of Iesus Christ made to his Apostles, Iohn 14. 15. whereby he promiseth them, that going from them, he would for a recompence, and for their comfort, send them the holy Ghost, whom he calleth the Comforter. Certainly if Iesus Christ is really present vnder the *species* in the holy Supper, our Lord could and would haue comforted them otherwise touching his absence, by saying, You shall no more haue me present touching my visible presence, but I will be really present vnder the bread, in your mouthes and in your stomackes, in such manner that I will be much more present and nearer vnto you then I was during my visible conuersation here on earth.

6 These considerations put vs in minde of the propheticall aduertisement of our Lord Iesus Christ, given Matth. 24. 24. saying, There shall arise false Prophets and false Christs, who shall shew great signes and wonders, and shall say, behold Christ is here, or he is there, or that he is in the secret chambers; whom he forbiddeth vs to beleue. Then when our aduersaries say, there is Christ in the host, or that God goeth
By,

by, or that he is in the pike, or in a chamber vnder locke and key, and that thereupon men tell vs of miracles, we admire the Propheticall words of the Sonne of God, and adore his iudgements, touching the hardening of mens hearts.

A briebe and certaine exposition of these words:

This is my bodie.

28. Sect.

Out of all that which is said before, it is an easie matter to set downe a briebe and certaine exposition of these words, *This is my bodie*, drawne out of the most expresse words of the Scripture.

The vnderstanding of these words depends vpon the right and true exposition of the word *This*, and of the exposition of the words, *my bodie*.

By the word *This*, it is out of question that Iesus Christ vnderstood that which he brake and gaue to his disciples, and that which he commanded them to eate. The Gospell witnesseth that Iesus Christ brake bread, *He tooke bread, and blessed it, and brake it*. And Saint Paul, 1. Cor. 10. 16. saith: *The bread which we breake*. And Acts 20. 7. *Being come together to breake bread*. And the Gospell witnesseth that Iesus Christ gaue bread, *He tooke bread, and blessed it, and brake it, and gaue it*. The Apostle Saint Paul also, 1. Cor. 11. witnesseth that it is bread that we eate, saying, *When you shall eate of this bread*. And againe, *But let a man examine himselfe, and so let him eate of that bread*. Then the sence of the word *This*, is thus; *The bread which I breake, and giue you to eate*.

And by consequence, these words, *This is my bodie*, are as much to say as, *this bread which I breake, and giue you to eate, is my body*. Which proposition being not true if it be taken in the literall sence, seeing that bread is not really and actually the body of Christ, it is certaine that in these words there is a figure.

Now

Now to know what this figure is, we must learne it by the words following, which Iesus Christ addeth, saying, *Do this in remembrance of me*: And by the nature of the present action, which is a Sacrament and a sacred signe, to the which by consequence sacramentall phraſes are conuenient. They are called sacramentall phraſes when the ſigne is called by the name of the thing ſignified, in the ſame manner that in the line following the Cup is called the couenant: becauſe it is a ſigne and a Sacrament of the couenant. Which is the vſuall manner of ſpeaking in the Scripture, as we haue ſhewed before.

This then is the expoſition of theſe words, *This is my bodie*, gathered out of the Scripture: *The bread which I breake, and which I giue you to eate, is the remembrance of my body*.

Which expoſition whoſoeuer reieſteth, reſiſteth ſo many expreſſe places of the Scripture, and againſt the nature of a Sacrament; and to auoid a figure ſimple, naturall and vſuall in the Scripture, and conuenient for the preſent action, induceth a multitude of vnaccuſtomed figures, without any example, and contrary to the nature of a Sacrament, as we will ſhew. And ſo affirms, that Ieſus Chriſt did eate himſelfe, that the body of our Lord and the diuell both at one time entred into *Iudas*. And that the Lord had a mortall bodie which ſate at the table with his diſciples, and that at the very ſame time he had a bodie without infirmitie, and impaſſible in the mouthes and ſtomackes of the Apoſtles: which obſtinacie of men reſolued to erre, God hath puniſhed with ſuch blindneſſe, that they are come euen to belecue that rats or mice can eate the body of our Lord, now when he is in heauen ſitting at the right hand of God.

*With what libertie our aduersaries forge figures,
and wrest the words of Iesus Christ and
of the Apostles.*

29. Sect.

Our aduersaries exclaim against vs because we take these words, *This is my bodie*, in a figuratiue sence: although the figure which we make therein is ordinarie, and perpetuall in the Scripture touching matter of Sacraments, and in regard that Iesus Christ could speake no otherwise, for that in his language there is not a word whereby he could say, *This representeth or signifieth my body*: as also that Iesus Christ expoundeth himselfe, saying, that it is a remembrance; and for that all the action, and all the words of the institution, and all the expositions added by the Apostles, enforce vs to vnderstand it so, as we haue already shewed.

Notwithstanding they themselves, to shun this vsuall and naturall figure for the present action, forge a multitude of vnaccustomed figures contrarie to the nature of the action, and there is not one word found in the Scripture touching this matter, to the which in a manner they give not a blow, and wherein they do not forge some figure, which marres the sence, and corrupteth the doctrine.

1 In these words, *This is my bodie*, they say that by the word *this*, we must vnderstand *under these species*, and that *this*, is an *individuum vagum*, which signifieth no certaine thing, and whereof the sence hangeth in suspence vntill such time as the words are fully pronounced.

2 They also say, that by the word *is*, we must vnderstand *shall be*, for they say that transubstantiation is not done till the words are pronounced.

3 In these words, *He tooke the cup, saying, This cup is the new covenant*, they say that the word *cup*, is a word of two significations, and that the first time the word *cup* signifieth the wine, and in the second time it signifieth the blood.

4 So when Saint *Matthew* saith, *This is my blood, the blood of the new Testament*, by the word *Testament*, they vnderstand the couenant of God. But when Saint *Luke* and Saint *Paul* say, *This cup is the new Testament in my blood*, they will haue the Testament to be Iesus Christ himselfe, and that the Testament and the testator should be all one.

5 In these words, *This cup is the new Testament in my blood*, they will haue vs by the *cup* to vnderstand the blood of Iesus Christ in the Eucharist, and by the words *my blood*, we must vnderstand the blood shed vpon the crosse, making another blood of Iesus Christ to be powred into the blood of Iesus Christ.

6 And when Christ calleth that which he dranke, the fruit of the vine, they say, that by the fruite of the vine we must vnderstand the blood, because it was wine before the conuersion, or because it hath an apparence thereof.

7 For the same reasons, when Saint *Paul* three times one after the other saith, that we eate bread, they will haue the word bread to signifie the bodie of Christ.

8 And when Saint *Paul* saith, *The bread that we breake, is the communion of the body of Christ*, they say, that by the bread we must vnderstand the bodie, and denie that the bread is broken, because the bodie (as they say) remaineth whole in euery peece of the host.

9 So when Iesus Christ so many times declareth, that he leaueth the world, and that he will be no more in the world, they adde, *visibly*, and so by the addition of one word they corrupt and peruert the meaning of many places of the Scripture.

10 And when the Lord, *Ioh. 6. 51.* saith, *That if any man eateth his flesh, he shall liue for euer*, they plainly perceiue, that if in those words Iesus Christ speaketh of the participation of the Sacrament, it must of force follow, that *Indas* and diuerse hypocrites which did and do participate therein, shall liue for euer: which to auoide, they adde to the Lords words, and say, that his meaning is, that if a man eateth the flesh of the Lord worthily, he shall liue for euer. But we maintaine that

1. Cor. II.

a man cannot eate the flesh of our Lord vnworthily, seeing that it cannot be eaten but onely spiritually and in faith, which cannot be done vnworthily. It is true that the Scripture speaketh of eating the bread vnworthily, but not of eating the flesh of our Lord vnworthily.

11 So when in the 53. verse the Lord saith, *Except ye eate the flesh of the Sonne of man, and drinke his bloud, ye haue no life in you*; they plainly see, that if there it is spoken of the holy Sacrament, the good theefe, and many faithfull persons which died, and die without hauing meanes of participating therein, shall be excluded from euerlasting life. Therefore here they adde a peece, and tell vs, that Iesus Christs intent was to say, *If you eate not my flesh, when you haue meanes to do it, ye shall not haue life eternal*. But the sentence of our Lord is true, simply and without exception. For whosoever eateth not the flesh of our Lord in faith, hath not life eternal.

12 And when our Lord saith, *If you drinke not my bloud, you shall not haue life eternal*, that they may not by this sentence be bound to minister the cup to the people, they say, that by the word *drinke*, the Lord vnderstood to take it without drinking, because the bloud also is in the host.

Now where are these men that are so great enemies to figures, and which sticke so fast and scrupulously to the letter? But therein they thinke they haue a priuiledge: for they say that the Church of Rome cannot erre in her interpretations:

* Th. 8. De concess. Prebend. cap. Propositus in Glossa. Papa contra Apostolum dispensat: Item contra vetus Testamentum. Et Dist. 34. Can. Lector. Papa potest contra Apostolum dispensare. Et Causa 25. Quast. 1. Can. Sunc quidam. Dispensat in Euangelio interpretando ipsum.

* & therefore the Glosse vpon the Decretals boldly saith, that the Pope may dispense against the Apostle, and against the old Testament, yea and that he dispenses with the Gospell, giuing it interpretations.

Of this the Glossa vpon the Decretals saith: Item contra Apostolum dispensat: Item contra vetus Testamentum. Et Dist. 34. Can. Lector. Papa potest contra Apostolum dispensare. Et Causa 25. Quast. 1. Can. Sunc quidam. Dispensat in Euangelio interpretando ipsum.

That

*That Transsubstantiation overthroweth the humanitie
of Iesus Christ, and exposeth it to great
opprobrie and disgrace.*

The worst mischiefe is, that by this doctrine the humanity of Iesus Christ is abolished, and the dignity of Priests exalted, contrary to the honour of the Sonne of God. This of all others is a principall heresie. For to overthrow the humane nature of Iesus Christ, is to cut the band in twaine which vnitech vs to God, and a stopping of the pipe whereby God maketh his celesticall benefits to fall downe vpon vs. God acknowledgeth vs to be his children for no other reason but because we are brethren to his Sonne. But we should not be brethren to the Sonne of God, if he were not a man as we are, and had not a humane nature like vnto ours. He was content to participate with our humane nature, that we might be partakers of his diuine nature, & to put on our flesh, to clothe vs with his Spirit. That is it which the Apostle Hebrewes 2. 17. saith, *Wherefore in all things it behoued him to be made like vnto his brethren.* And 4. 15. *He was in all points tempted like as we are, yet without siane:* that he might be touched with the feeling of our infirmities, and that hauing a brother which is inheritor of the kingdome of heauen, we might be coheires with him by vertue of that alliance.

This doctrine of Transsubstantiation then vndermineth piety at the very root, and wounds religion at the heart.

1 For Iesus Christ hath not a true humane body, if the parts of his body be not differint in situation, and in if euery part of the host his body be whole, so that his head and his feete are in the whole host, and his head and his feet in euery particular part thereof.

2 To take from a body those things whereby it differeth from a spirit, is to make it no more a body but a spirit. But by transsubstantiation the body of our Lord is bereft of all the

properties and differences whereby a body is distinguished from a spirit. For vnder the *species* they make it to be without space, and without circumscription, hauing no place, no measure, nor space, nor parts or members situated apart in their places.

3 And as in a point there is neither length nor breadth, whosoeuer placeth an humane body all whole vnder an indiuisible point, bereaueth it of all length and breadth, and by consequent maketh it to be no more a body.

4 In the Eucharist they make the body of our Lord to be more spirituall then the soules. For a soule is, but in one place, & is neuer separated from it selfe, as they say the Lords body is, which is whole in heauen, and whole in an hundred thousand places here on earth all at one time, and is not in the region betweene both.

5 Also euery humane body hath his interior parts situated in their naturall places, as the heart inclosed in the heart-case, the braine that filleth the membranes and the inner hollownesse of the head. If that be not in Iesus Christ, he is no man. Then seeing it is manifest that the interior parts of the body of Iesus Christ occupie a space, and are circumscribed by the place, which is the interior superficies of the body which containeth them, is it not a contradiction vnto themselves to beleue that the seuerall parts of the body of Christ do fill a space, and are contained in a place, but that all the body doth not fill any space, nor is contained in any place? As if one should say, that euery seuerall part of a body is white, and that the whole body is blacke.

6 Againe, by transubstantiation they make and produce a body which was a body before they make it. For the body of Iesus Christ which is already in heauen, is made by the Priest here on earth: as if while *M. Arnoux* is at Paris, he should be begotten in Rome.

7 We haue shewed before that this doctrine giues Iesus Christ two contrary bodies at one time: one body sitting at the table, the other in the mouthes of the Apostles which sate not at the table: one body speaking and mouing, the other
not

not speaking, nor able to stirre it selfe. One a weake and passible body, the other without infirmitie and impassible. One body which suffered and sweat drops of bloud, the other in the stomackes of the Apostles, which suffered no paine: which of these is our redeemer?

8 And when they say that the consecrated host is round, what meane they by the host? Do they vnderstand Iesus Christ? Iesus Christ is not round. Or do they vnderstand the accidents? Those accidents are not the host. In this matter they can hardly speake three words without contradicting themselves.

9 It serues not their turnes to giue the body of Christ two beings, the one naturall, the other sacramentall. For, besides that one thing can haue but one being, and that to giue Iesus Christ a sacramentall being, that is to say, significatiue, is to build castles in the aire; our aduersaries confesse, that vnder the *species* Iesus Christ hath also his naturall being: whereby it followeth, that also in that naturall being which is vnder the *species*, these things must happen vnto it, to be in no place, to haue no space, to haue his length vnder a point, and such like things disagreeing with a true body.

10 The worst is, that by scattering the body of our Lord in many places at once, the Church of Rome maketh the History of the Gospell not onely doubtfull but also ridiculous. For if the body of Iesus Christ can be in diuerse places at once, and distant one farre from another, and neuertheless still remaine an humane body, who can assure me that then when Iesus Christ was vpon the crosse, he was not walking in another place? and that when he was before *Pilate* in Ierusalem, he was not asleepe in Alexandria? and that when he was in the blessed virgine *Maries* wombe, he was not in other womens wombes? And why Iesus Christ went so often from Galilee to Ierusalem, seeing that without stirring from Galilee he might be in Ierusalem? and when *Ioseph* and *Marie* had left him in Ierusalem against their wills, why turned they backe againe to fetch him, seeing that he could stay in Ierusalem, and yet haue followed them in the way?



11. For it is an abuse to say vnto vs, that as then the body of Christ was not yet glorified: seeing that in the institution of this Sacrament he was yet weake and not glorified, and yet they say, that then his body was whole vnder euery part of the host, and in euery one of his disciples mouthes.

12. If for an answer thereunto they aske vs, and say, Is not God powerfull enough to do it? I will likewise answer them, and say, That God is no lesse powerfull to do otherwise, and that he is wise to do no such thing. All that which is written in the Alcoran may be proued in the same manner, by saying that God is able to do so. The will, and not the power of God is the rule of our beleefe. It is a great wrong to binde the omnipotent power of God to do all that which we imagine or conceiue, and to bind it with ridiculous bands, vnder pretence of exalting him to make him captiue to vs. God is omnipotent because he doth all whatsoeuer he will, and not all that we will prescribe vnto him. But we haue seene before that the will of God is cleane contrary vnto that which our aduersaries will haue him to will.

13. And though we ought onely to endeavour to exalt the omnipotencie of God without making inquirie of his will, yet it shall appeare that we exalt the power of God and of our Lord Iesus Christ, and that our aduersaries diminish and derogate from it.

For, it is much more agreeable to the power of Iesus Christ to communicate himselfe vnto vs without coming downe here vpon earth: as the Sunne is much more admirable by making it selfe present with vs from so farre off, and making vs feeble his vertue, then if his body should approach nearer to the earth.

14. Adde hereunto, that vnder the host Iesus Christ is not onely put into the power of a man, but also made so vnable, that our aduersaries acknowledge, that vnder the *species* he can neither breathe, moue, nor open his eyes: for how should he there change place seeing he hath no place? How should he go vnder the *species*, seeing they put him whole vnder one indiuisible point which hath no length? For

all

all moning requires some extension.

15 Is this an exalting of the Maiestie and greatnesse of the eternall Sonne of God, to make him subiect to the will of a Priest, which many times is not an honest man, who maketh Iesus Christ when he will, carrieth him whither he will, and keepes him vnder locke and key? and to make cautions and prouisions against all inconueniences that may happen, if the blood shall chance to be spilt, or to freeze, or if rats gnaw or eate the body of Iesus Christ, or if the Priest by weakenesse or drunkennesse casteth vp the host out of his stomacke? Is this an honoring of God, and of his eternall Sonne, to call God an host that may be stolen away? that may receiue cuts with a knife, like the Iesus Christ of Billetes in Paris? that may be carried away by beasts? that may fall into the dirt, and being fallen cannot rise againe? For although they say that Iesus Christ suffereth nothing by all that, because he is impassible, yet thereby he is greatly dishonored, and the Sonne of God is openly derided, and exposed to the laughter of the enemies of the Gospell.

16 It is also a dishonour to Iesus Christ, to make men beleeue that the bones and relikes of Saints, dead at the least 12. or 15. hundred yeares before, can remaine without rotting, and yet by experience to acknowledge, that the host becometh mouldy in a few dayes, and that the presence of Iesus Christ, which is in it (as they say) doth not preserve it from vermine and the teeth of beasts.

17 But Iesus Christ is specially dishonoured hereby, that in the Papall procession the host is carried vpon a curtall with a lanterne, but the Pope is borne vpon the shouldders of Kings and Princes, or vpon the shouldders of their ambassadors. And that in the Papall Masse the Pope is ten times more honored, and there is ten times more reuerence and religious honor done vnto him then to God, which (as they say) he holdeth in his hands.

18 The ancient Fathers spake of the body of our Lord with more respect; for they were so farre off from beleeuing that it could be eaten by rats, that on the contrarie they belee-

This procession is set out in the first booke of Ceremonies, lib. 1. sect. 2.

* Qui discor-
dat à Christo
nec carnem
Christi man-
ducat, nec san-
guinem bibit,
et si tanta rei
Sacramentum
ad iudicium
sui quotidie
accipit.
Illi manduca-
bant panem
Dominum, ille
panem Domini
contra Domi-
num.

ued that prophane persons eate it not, although they receive the Sacrament. * Saint *Augustine* in his booke of Sentences collected by *Prosper*, saith, *He that disagreeth with Iesus Christ, eateth not the flesh of Christ, nor drinketh his blood, although he receiveth the sacrament of so great a thing to his condemna- tion.* And in the 56. Tractise vpon Saint *Iohn*, he saith, that the disciples did eate the bread which is the Lord, but that *Iudas* did eate the bread of the Lord, against the Lord. For this Doctor beleueed that Iesus Christ is not eaten but by faith.

That in the sixth chapter of Saint Iohn there is nothing that maketh for Transsubstantiation, and that there is not any thing at all spoken of eating the flesh of Iesus Christ with the mouth.

31. Sect.

The Capernaitan Iewes followed Iesus Christ into the desert, not to heare his words, but to be fed with bread. But Iesus Christ making their gluttony a meanes to instruct them, from thence tooke occasion to speake vnto them of another kind of food, and of a celestially bread, whereof whosoever eateth liueth eternally, and that bread is himselfe. And it is to be noted, that then the holy Supper was not instituted, nor in two yeares after.

The difference betweene vs and our aduersaries consisteth in this eating. We say, that in this Chapter he speaketh onely of a spirituall eating which is done by faith: in the same manner as in the fourth Chapter Iesus Christ speaketh to the Samanitan woman, of a water whereof whosoever shall drinke shall neuer thirst: where he speaketh not of a materiall water but of a spirituall grace. But our aduersaries say, that in this Chapter he speaketh of two sorts of eating, the one spirituall by faith, which is continued from the 32. to the 50. verse: the other corporall, which is done by the mouth of the body, by the which Iesus Christ is really eaten with the mouth in the

Eucha-

Eucharist, whereof they say Iesus Christ speaketh in the rest of the Chapter.

But if we examine the whole tenour of Christs speech, we shall not find any one clause therein, which is not contrary to this eating of Iesus Christ with the mouth.

1 In the 32. and 30. verses he saith, that he is the bread that came downe from heauen, shewing, that that bread is not onely the flesh of Iesus Christ, (for that descended not from heauen) but also his Diuinitie. Then if that bread which descended from heauen should be eaten with the mouth, we must also eate the Diuinitie.

2 In the 35. verse he saith, *I am the bread of life*: words which serue for the vnderstanding of these words, *This is my bodie*. For if by these words, *This is my body*, we must vnderstand, *This is Transubstantiated into my body*, we must also by these words, *I am the bread*, vnderstand that Iesus Christ is transubstantiated into bread.

3 Iesus Christ addeth, *He that beleeueth in me, shall neuer thirst*. Where plainly he putteth, *to beleene*, in stead of, *to drinke*; seeing he saith, that by beleeuing our thirst shall be quenched. The coherence of his discourse, and the naturall consequence, requireth that he should haue said, *He that drinketh shall neuer thirst*: but he said, *He that beleeueth*, in stead of, *He that drinketh*; to teach vs that he speaketh of a drinke which is taken by faith. *Bellarmino* acknowledgeth the same, and confesseth that in that place there is nothing spoken of the Sacrament, but of faith in the incarnation.

4 The 47. verse is no lesse plaine, where the Lord saith, *He that beleeueth in me hath life eternall: I am the bread of life*. He sheweth, that this bread is taken by faith. For, seeing that he which beleeueth in him hath life euertlasting, from thence he inferreth, that he is the bread of life.

5 In the 50. verse he addeth, *If any man eateth of this bread he shall not die*: and in the 54. verse, *He that eateth my flesh, hath life euertlasting*. Then wicked persons eate not the flesh of our Lord, because they haue not life eternall. For it is certaine that Iesus Christ speaketh not of eating with the mouth, nor

of the Eucharist: for many eate thereof which haue not life eternall; as *Indas*, and an infinite number of hypocrites.

Our aduersaries to excuse themselves herein, adde a peece which is fetcht out of their owne braines, and not to be found in the word of God: for they say, that Iesus Christ vnderstood, that he that eateth his flesh worthily hath life eternall. But this word *worthily* is vnworthily added by them, and cleane contrary to the truth, seeing that thereby they suppose that a man may eate the flesh of our Lord vnworthily. For seeing that to eate the flesh of the Sonne of man, is to trust in his death, as we haue proued, and our aduersaries do confesse, it is manifest, that no man can vnworthily beleue in Iesus Christ, seeing that all our worthinesse consisteth in beleeuing in Iesus Christ. Saint *Paul*, 1. Cor. 11. speaketh of eating the bread vnworthily, but not of eating the Lords body vnworthily. A man may take the signe, but not the truth vnworthily. Therefore, as to excuse themselves touching the place in Saint *Iohn*, they adde their owne imagination to the word of God: so to defend themselves against this place of Saint *Paul*, they make a figure thereof. And this word *worthily* being by them added, yet that place is still contrary to the Church of Rome, which beleueth that many which haue taken the host worthily, are neuerthelessse damned.

6 The 53. verse is of no lesse force, where Iesus Christ saith, *Except ye eate the flesh of the Sonne of man, and drinke his blood, ye haue no life in you.* There it is plaine, that he speaketh not of eating the Sacrament with the mouth: for he speaketh of an eating necessary to saluation, without the which a man cannot haue eternall life. Now many attaine to eternall life which neuer participated in that Sacrament, as Saint *Iohn Baptist*, the theefe crucified with Iesus Christ and many faithfull persons that died before they were partakers of the same. If we do not eate the flesh of the Lord but in the Sacrament, what shall become of so many faithfull persons which did not participate in the same? Then here againe they adde another peece vnto the word of God: for they say, that Iesus Christ would haue said, *If you eate not the flesh of the Sonne*

of man while you haue meanes to do it, you shall not haue life eternall. There is no sentence in the Scripture so expresse, which may not be peruerted by thrusting in of words, and adding somewhat of our owne thereunto. And yet this being added, this place condemneth the Church of Rome, which beleeueth not, that all those that receiue not the host at Easter, when they haue meanes to do it, are therefore damned. The Church of Rome neuer giueth the consecrated host to men that are condemned to die, yet our aduersaries do not beleue that they are damned.

7 In the 56. verse the Lord addeth, *He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me and I in him.* This concerneth not eating with the mouth, either in regard of hypocrites, or in regard of the faithfull. For if an hypocrite hath receiued the Sacrament, that makes him not to dwell in Iesus Christ: and if a faithfull person hath receiued it, the Church of Rome doth not beleue that Iesus Christ dwelleth in him: for the saith, that as soone as the *species* are digested in the stomacke, the body of Iesus Christ is no more there.

8 Lastly, Iesus Christ, to aduertise his disciples that his words ought not to be taken in a carnall and grosse sence, but to shew them that they are quickening & spirituall, saith vnto them, *These words are spirit and life.* But they giue not life if they be not taken spiritually.

9 You must also note, that in all this discourse, wherein he promiseth to giue his flesh to be eaten, he spake to the Capernaite Iewes, to whom he neuer administred the Eucharist, and which continued obstinately in their Iewish opinions. It is certaine that Iesus Christ is no lyer: if he had promised to administer the Sacrament to the Capernaiteans, he wold haue kept his promise: and the vnworthinesse of the Capernaiteans could not haue kept the Lord from offering the Sacrament vnto them according to his promise, which neuertheless he did not. By this meanes our aduersaries, as much as in them lyeth, make Iesus Christ a lyer.

10 We must likewise remember, that the Eucharist was not as then instituted, nor till two yeares after; and yet at that time

time Iesus Christ was the true bread of life. For in the 35. verse he saith, *I am the bread of life*; and in the 50. verse, *This is the bread, &c.* And in the 54. verse, *He that eateth my flesh, &c.* From that time therefore this bread was eaten by the faithfull, although the Eucharist was not then instituted.

We must not thinke it strange, if sometimes he speaketh in the future tense, saying, *This bread which I will give, &c.* for he had a respect to his death, wherein he was to giue himselfe for the life of the world.

We must not likewise wonder when the Lord saith, that his flesh is meate indeed: for this word *indeed*, doth not hinder but that the word flesh may be taken figuratiuely, no more then whē Iesus Christ in the 15. 1. of S. Ioh. saith, *I am the true vine*; where the word *true* excludeth not the figure. Figuratiue words cease not to be true. Adde moreover that the flesh of Iesus Christ crucified is the true food of our soules. The soule hath two principall faculties, the vnderstanding and the will: the vnderstanding is nourished by instruction, the will by consolation. The flesh of Iesus Christ crucified furnisheth these two nourishments. For by the death of Iesus Christ we are certified and instructed of and in the meanes that God hath ordained to reconcile himselfe vnto vs; and that onely is our soueraigne consolation; for without it our soules languish and wither in despaire, like a member fallen into a consumption, or like a body destitute of nourishment.

We must not thinke it strange that our Sauour Iesus Christ vsed this allegory, seeing that not long before he vsed the like allegory, speaking to the Samaritan woman of a water whereof whosoever shall drinke shall neuer thirst. And that it is an ordinary thing in the Scripture to call the word of God and his graces, sometimes bread, sometimes milke, and sometimes strong meate. Besides that Iesus Christ had particular reasons to moue him to speake in that manner to the Capernaitans, that had as it were forcibly constrained him to vse that allegory, importunately asking him, if he could do as *Moses* did, that gaue them bread from heauen. As also that they were incredulous, to whom he vsed to speake by figures

and

and parables, as Saint *Matthew* 13. 34. saith, *And without a parable spake he not unto them.*

Our aduersaries themselves acknowledge, that to the 50. verse *Iesus Christ* did not speake of eating of the Sacrament which is done with the mouth, but of that which is done by faith: but in the verses following they say that he speaketh of eating with the mouth. And yet in all that chapter there is nothing said of two kinds of eating, nor any thing that should moue vs so to vnderstand that speech of *Iesus Christ*.

And I wonder how they dare in such manner contradict * *Pope Innocent* the third, who in the fourteenth chapter and fourth booke of the *Mysteries of the Masse*, declareth, that in those verses which our aduersaries alledge for eating with the mouth, *Christ* speaketh of spirituall eating by faith, and saith, *The Lord* speaketh of spirituall eating, saying, *If you eate not the flesh of the Sonne of man, and drinke not his blood, you shall not haue eternall life in you.* In this manner those onely that are good eate the body of our Lord. And therefore he saith, *He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him.* For he that dwelleth in charitie dwelleth in God and God in him. Why dost thou prepare thy teeth and thy belly? Beleeue and thou hast eaten.

With the like obstinancie they oppose themselves against *Pope Gelasius*, who in his booke against *Eutyches*, and against *Nestorius*, speaketh thus of the holy Sacrament b Certainly the Sacraments of the body and blood of our Lord which we receiue, are a diuine thing, and so by them we are made partakers of the diuine nature. And yet the substance or nature of bread and wine still remaine. And certainly the image and resemblance of the body and of the blood of *Christ* is celebrated in this mystrie. But our aduersaries had rather disagree with their Popes then to agree with vs. But if that booke was not made by *Pope Gelasius*, as the title importeth, but by *Gelasius* Bishop of *Cæsarea* in *Palestina*, as *Bellarmino* suspecteth, the booke shall be the more ancient and of greater authority. *Neuerthelesse*, *Photius* speaking of *Gelasius* workes, maketh mention of a booke entituled, *De azymorum*, which

a De spiritali
li comestione
Dominus ait
Nisi manducaueritis carnem Filij hominis & biberitis eius sanguinem, non habebitis vitam in vobis.
Hoc modo corpus Christi soli boni comedant, &c.
b Certe sacramenta qua sumimus corporis & sanguinis Christi, diuina res est, propter quod & per eadem diuina effici-mur consortes nature, & tamē esse non desunt substantia vel natura panis & vini. Et certe imago & similitudo corporis & sanguinis Christi in actione mysteriorum celebrantur.

were

were of the sect of *Arians*, but speaketh nothing of the booke against *Eutyches* and *Nestorius*.

The Decretall of the Romish Church, in the second Distinction of Consecration, is full of expresse sentences to that purpose. In the Canon *Prima quidem*, Understand that which I say spiritually. You shall not eat that body which you see, nor drinke the bloud which those that shall crucifie me will shed. I haue recommended a sacred signe vnto you, which being vnderstood spiritually, will quicken you.

And in the Canon *Uti quid*: Why doest thou prepare thy teeth and thy bellie? Beleeue and thou hast eaten: for so beleeue in him, is to eat the bread and the wine; he that beleeueth in him eateth him.

Which contrarieth not those that by eating vnderstand something more then to beleeue, and therein also comprehend the effect of faith, which is to be nourished and quickened: which comes all to one, for of necessitie the one followeth the other.

We conclude therefore, that in this chapter Iesus Christ speaketh not of eating his body with the mouth, neither vnderstandeth that he must go downe into our stomackes. For the nourishment of the soule is not receiued by the mouth of the body. To feed the body by hearing, and to feed the soule by the mouth, are two like absurdities. It is not more absurd to feede the stomacke with songs, then to cause the nourishment of the soule to passe through our teeth and our throats. Iesus Christ cannot be eaten by his enemies, much lesse by beasts. He is the bread of children and not of strangers. This bread is given to the liuing, and not to the dead: to dwell in vs, and not to passe through vs. It is a meate necessary for saluation, and not as the Sacrament of his body, without the which many are saued, and which turnes to many mens condemnation. It is a remedy against all our sinnes, and not onely against veniall sinnes and those whereof mens consciences are already discharged, as the Church of Rome teacheth: making the Eucharist to be a plaister for a wound that is healed, and a meane to discharge mens consciences of sinnes, whereof

a Spiritua-
liter intelli-
ge quod locu-
tum, non
hoc corpus
good videtur
manducatur
essu, & bibi-
turi illum san-
guinem quem
effusi sunt
qui me cruci-
fixerunt. Sacra-
mentum ali-
quod vobis
commendatur
spiritualiter
intelligetur
vivificabit
vobis.
b Ps quid pa-
ras dentem &
ventrem: eru-
de & mandu-
catis. Credere
anim in eum,
hoc est panem
& vinum man-
ducare. Qui
credit in eum
manducatur
eum.

Bellar. lib. 4.
de Euchar.
cap. 17. & 18.

whereof they are already discharged. Whereby they make the Eucharist to be a thousand times of lesse efficacie then Baptisme, wherein there is no transubstantiation made. For they say, that Baptisme is simply necessary for saluation, and that by Baptisme all precedent sinnes, as well mortall as veniall, are blotted out, both for the guile and for the punishment.

That the Masse, and the Decretals and Glosses of the Church of Rome, ouerthrow Transsubstantiation.

Although the marke of Papall religion is to go to Masse, yet the Masse is much contrary to the Papacie. For the Canon of the Masse is composed of diuerse peeces set together, whereof the greatest part are ancient prayers which overthrow Merits, Purgatorie, and Transsubstantiation. 32. *Self.*

You must vnderstand that in the Primitiue Church the sacred table stood in the middle of the Church, whereupon the people came to offer gifts and presents of bread and wine, and of fruits, which presents were called oblations and sacrifices. Of that bread and wine brought in great quantity and set vpon the table, the Minister tooke one part for the celebration of the holy Sacrament, as much as needed to communicate the same vnder both kinds vnto the faithfull; the rest was for the poore. Before the administration of the Sacrament to the people, they made all the Catechumeni, Penitents, and such as were possessed, and all those that either would not, or could not receiue the communion, to go out of the Church.

Ouer these presents and gifts of the people, appointed for the celebration of the holy Supper, diuers prayers were said, whereof the greatest part are at this day said in the Masse, but changed into another sence. For as in stead of a quantitie of bread to communicate to all the assembly, at this day they haue but a litle round wafer which they call god: so whereas those prayers were said ouer the bread and the wine, now the same

same prayers are said ouer the consecrated host, which they say is Iesus Christ. Whereby it happeneth, that in those prayers the Priest speaketh against his owne intent, and plainly contradicteth his Churches beleefe, and pronounceth words that are iniurious to Iesus Christ.

a Panem sanctum vite aeternae, & calicem salutis perpetuae. Super qua propitio ac sereno vultu respice, et dignetur et accepta habere ut accepta habere dignatus es munera pueri tui iusti Abel.

For after the words of ^a Consecration, offering Iesus Christ to God, he speaketh in this manner to God, saying, Upon which things may it please thee to looke with a good and favourable countenance, and to accept of them, as thou diddest accept of the presents of *Abel* thy righteous child. This prayer might be said vpon the offerings and almes of the people, but in no sort vpon Iesus Christ. For is there any likelihood that Iesus Christ should be called *These things*, as if they spake of diuerse Iesus Christs, and of things without life? Againe, can he without impietie desire God to accept as well of Iesus Christ as he accepted of the beast sacrificed by *Abel*? Their ordinary excuse in this is, that the Priest doth not desire God to accept as well of Iesus Christ as he did accept of the lambe offered by *Abel*, but that God would be pleased to accept as well of our deuotion as of that of *Abels*. But the words of the Masse will not beare this exposition, which compare not *Abels* deuotion with ours, but the presents which the Priest offereth to God with those that *Abel* offered, saying, Accept as well of these sacrifices and of these presents, as thou diddest accept of *Abels* presents. The host and the present is not the deuotion. There is great difference betweene a present, and the will, which oftentimes is accepted without a present.

b Supplices te rogamus omnipotens Deus, iube hac porceri per manus sancti Angelis tui in sublimi altaris tui.

c Memento etiam Domine famularumque suarum qui nos praecesserunt cum signo fidei, et dormiunt in somno pacis.

The Priest addeth ^b *We beseech thee most puissant God, to command that these things may be borne by the hands of thy holy Angell into thy beauenly Pallace, into the presence of thy diuine Maestie.* Is there any thing in all this that can be applied to Iesus Christ? Is Iesus Christ presented by the Angels to his Father? Hath he any need of the helpe of Angels to be presented to God?

There followeth a prayer for the dead, ^c saying, *Lord remember thy seruants which haue gone before vs with the signe of faith,*

faith, and that sleepe in peace. For then they beleueed not that mens soules were burnt in a fire.

After this there followeth a long catalogue of the names of many Saints; which rehearsed, they make this prayer to God, saying, *In whose company we beseech thee to receive vs, not regarding our merits, but pardoning our offences.* This is contrary to merits.

But the words that immediatly follow are specially to be considered, where it is said, *By Christ our Lord, by whom, oh Lord, thou alwayes createst for vs all these good things, thou sanctifiest, quickenest, and blessest them.* Is there any thing in all this that agreeth to Iesus Christ? For can they call the consecrated bread which they call the host, *all these good things*, if that host be Iesus Christ? Doth God alwayes quicken Iesus Christ? Doth God create and quicken Iesus Christ by Iesus Christ? These speeches are fit being applied to the bread and wine, but not vnto Iesus Christ. If by these words they vnderstand that he speaketh of the bread and wine, considering them as they were before consecration, thereby they fall into three ineuitable absurdities. The one is, that they giue thanks vnto God, because he created the bread and the wine in the Eucharist, when that bread and wine is no more bread & wine. The second is, that he sheweth the bread and the wine, as being present, saying, *Hæc omnia bona, All these good things*, when those things are no more those good things; vsing a demonstratiue pronōwne of a thing present, to shew nothing. The third absurditie is, that those words are spoken then when the Priest is about to lift vp the host to cause it to be adored. Is not this a thing against all reason and apparence, that then when men adore the host, and pretend to sacrifice the eternall Sonne of God to God, the Priest giueth thanks to God because he causeth the bread and wine to grow? and remembreth not to giue him thanks because he hath put Iesus Christ into his hands to sacrifice and to eate him? As if then when they are to render vp their soules vnto God, they should giue thanks vnto God, because he maketh it raine vpon the vines, without giuing him thanks for redee-

ming

*Intra quorum
nos consortium
non affirmator
meriti sed re-
na largitor
admittas, per
Christum Do-
minum nostrū,
per quem Do-
mine hæc om-
nia semper
bona creas,
sanctificas, vi-
uificas, benedi-
cis.*

ming our soules from hell, by the death of Iesus Christ.

The many signes of the Crosse ^a which the Priest maketh vpon the host and vpon the cup, witnesse that the beleefe of the Church of Rome hath bene changed. For Pope Innocent the third, in his second booke of the Mysteries of the Masse; 38. chap. saith, that the Priest makes signes of the Crosse vpon these things to driue away the diuell, lest he should preuaile against the Priest, or against the sacrifice, that is, against Iesus Christ. But it is not credible that those who brought in that custome, would be so ridiculously officious, as to take vpon them by signes of the Crosse made in the aire, to defend Iesus Christ against the diuell.

The Glosse of the Romish Decretall vpon the Canon *Hoc est*, in the 2. Distinction of Consecration, is no lesse expresse touching this subiect then if it had bene made at Geneva:

*v Efficit super
ea crucis sig-
nificaculum, ut
per crucem vir-
tutem omnes
conatus dia-
bolice maligni-
tatis effu-
giant, ne con-
tra sacerdotem
vel sacrificiū
aliquo modo
periculentur.
b Celeste Sa-
cramentum
quod verò re-
presentat
Christi carnem
dicitur corpus
Christi, sed
improprie, unde
dicitur suo
modo, sed non
rei veritate,
sed significante
mysterio, ut
sit sensus, vo-
catur corpus
Christi, s. sig-
nificatur.*

*c Can. Qui
discordat a
Christo non
manducat car-
nem eius, nec
bibit sangui-
nem, est tanta
rei sacramen-
tum ad iudi-
cium sua per-
ditionis quotidie accipit.*

*b The celestiall Sacrament which truly representeth the flesh of
Christ, is called the body of Christ, but improperly: And therefore
it is called so after a sort, but not in the truth of the thing, but by a
significant mysterie: So that this is the true sence, it is called the
body of Christ, that is, it is signified thereby. These words are ve-
ry considerable.*

In the same Distinction it is said, ^c *He that disagreeeth with
Iesus Christ eateth not his flesh, nor drinketh his blood, although
every day he receiveth the Sacrament of so great a thing to his con-
demnation.*

The like in the Canon *De hac*. ^d *It is permitted to eat of this
host which is wonderfully made in remembrance of Iesus Christ.
But no man is permitted in the same to eat of that which Iesu
Christ offered vpon the altar of the Crosse.*

And in the Canon *Quia morte*, (likewise taken out of
Saint Augustine) It is said, ^e *Because we are deliuered by the death
of our Lord, in remembrance thereof, when we eat and drinke
we signifie his flesh and his blood, which were offered for vs.*

*d De hac quidem hostia qua in Christi commemoratione mirabiliter
fit edere licet, De illa vero quam Christus in ara crucis obtulit, secundum se nulli edere licet.
e Quia morte Domini liberati sumus, huius rei memoriam in edendo & potando, carnem & san-
guinem qua pro nobis oblata sunt, significamus.*

The Masse (as we haue seene) hath diuers formall prayers against Transubstantiation: yet there is a manifest fraud vsed, and a changing of the ancient Liturgie. The Priest saith:

"Which oblation, may it please thee oh God in all things to make it, blesse it, register it, ratifie it, and accept it, that vnto vs it may be made the bodie and the bloud of thy most deare Sonne."

But we haue the same prayer in the 5. Chap. of the 4. booke of Sacraments, among Saint Ambrose works, in these words:

" Make this oblation for vs to be esteemed as reasonable, and acceptable, which is the figure of the body and of the bloud of our Lord Iesus Christ."*

An horrible deprauation; for whereas the ancient Fathers said, that this oblation is the figure of the body of Christ, they say, That this oblation may be made vnto vs the body of Christ. This deserues seriously to be thought vpon.

*nostri Iesu Christi. Qui pridie, &c. ** Fac nobis hanc oblationem ascriptam, rationabilem, acceptabilem, quod est figura corporis & sanguinis Domini nostri Iesu Christi. Qui pridie, &c.*

" Quam oblationem tu Deus in omnibus quasumus benedictam, ascriptam, rationabilem, acceptabilemque facere digneris, ut nobis corpus & sanguis fiat dilectissimi filij tui Domini

Certaine places out of the ancient Fathers touching this subject.

Tertullian in his third booke against Marcion, the 19. Chap. 33. Sect.

"saith, God hath so reuealed it in your Gospell, calling the bread his bodie, that thereby thou mightest vnderstand, that he hath made the bread to be the figure of his bodie."

Also in his fourth booke against Marcion, 40. chapter, disputing against the Marcionites which denied that Iesus Christ had a true bodie, he saith, *Iesus Christ hauing taken bread and giuen it to his disciples, made it to be his bodie, saying, This is my bodie, that is to say, the figure of my bodie: now this should not be a figure if he had not had a true bodie.* His reason is, because we cannot truly prefigure those things that are not.

Cyprian in the third Epistle of his second booke saith, *"saith, find that the cup which the Lord offered was mixed, and that that which he called his bloud was wine."*

a Panem suum corpus appellans, ut & hinc iam quoniam intelligas corpus suum figuram panis dedit. b Acceptum panem & distributum discipulis, corpus suum fecit, dicendo, Hoc est corpus meum: id est, figura corporis mei.

c Vinum fuit quod sanguinem suum discis.

is set to lay hold on him? To this that holy personage answereth and saith: *Servd thy father this ber, and thou hast laid hold upon him: thy ancestors (the Iewes) had him bodily among them, bold thou him in thy heart.* And in the first Treatise vpon the first Epistle of Saint Iohn, he saith, *Ipsū in celo sedentem manu contrahere non possumus, sed fide contingere: Being set in heauen, we cannot handle him any more with our hands, but we may touch him with our hearts.*

In the 23. Epistle to Boniface, he saith, ^a *The Sacrament of the bodie of Christ, in some manner is the bodie of Christ, and the Sacrament of the bloud of Christ, is the bloud of Christ.* And to shew how the Sacrament of the bodie of Christ is the bodie of Christ, he saith for example, it is as Baptisme which is the Sacrament of faith is faith, and as we are said to be buried by Baptisme.

And in the sixteenth Chapter of the third booke of Christian Doctrine ^b *If (saith Iesus Christ) you eate not the flesh of the Sonne of man, and drinke not his bloud, you shall not haue life in you: It seemeth that he commandeth a wicked thing. Therefore it is a figure; commanding vs to communicate in the passion of the Lord, and sweetly and profitably to haue in remembrance, that his flesh was crucified and wounded for vs.* Note, that he doth not onely say, that there is a figure in these words, *If you eate not the flesh of the Sonne of man*, but also that he expoundeth this figure, thus, that in the sixt Chapter of Saint Iohn, to eate the flesh of the Lord, is to haue his death and passion in remembrance; which is an exposition which the Church of Rome receiueth not.

Ephraim Patriarch of Antiochia, alledged by Photius in his Librarie, saith, ^c *The bodie of Christ which the faithfull receive, loseth not his sensible substance; and is not separated from the intelligible grace. Also Baptisme being wholly spiritual and single, keepeth the proper tie of his sensible substance, that is to say, of water, and loseth not that which it was before.* This is an

^a Sicut ergo secundū quendam modum Sacramentum corporis Christi corpus Christi est, Sacramentum sanguinis Christi sanguis Christi est: ita Sacramentum fidei fides est.

^b Nisi manducaueritis carnem filij hominis & non biberitis eius sanguinem, non habebitis vitam in vobis. Facinus vel flagitium videtur subire. Figura est ergo praecepti passionis Dominica esse communicandum & suauiter acq̃ue veliter recordendum in memoria, quod pro nobiscato eius crucifixus & vulneratus sit.

^c Pag. 415. editione August.

ἐπεὶ ὁ ἰησοῦς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ πατρὸς ἀπεσταλμένος ἔσθαι καὶ πίνειν τὸ αἷμα τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ πατρὸς, καὶ οὐκ ἐστὶν ἀδύνατον μὴ καὶ ἡμεῖς τοῦ βαπτίσματος ἡμετέρου καὶ ἡμεῖς τοῦ ἰησοῦ τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ πατρὸς ἀπολαύειν, καὶ οὐκ ἐστὶν ἀδύνατον ὅτι ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ πατρὸς ἀπεσταλμένος ἔσθαι καὶ πίνειν τὸ αἷμα τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ πατρὸς, καὶ οὐκ ἐστὶν ἀδύνατον ἡμεῖς τοῦ βαπτίσματος ἡμετέρου καὶ ἡμεῖς τοῦ ἰησοῦ τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ πατρὸς ἀπολαύειν.

excellent place, for it sheweth in what sence the ancient Fathers called the Sacrament the bodie of Christ, seeing it is said, that it keepeth his first sensible substance, that is, the substance of bread, even as the substance of water remaineth in Baptisme.

Virgilius in his fourth booke against *Eutyches*, saith, *¶ If the Word and the flesh haue but one nature, how cometh it to passe, that the Word being in all places, the flesh also is not in all places? for when it was here on earth, it was not in heauen; and now when it is in heauen, it is not here on earth.* Our aduersaries seeke to defend themselves against this place, by saying, that the flesh of Christ is no more visible here on earth. But this excuse might as well haue serued the *Eutychians*, who said also that the flesh of the Lord is no more visibly present. They dispute therefore against *Virgilius*, and ioyne with the ancient heretickes. Furthermore *Virgilius* conceiues, that the flesh of Iesus Christ being on earth, was not in heauen neither visibly nor inuisibly. Whence it followeth, that he also meaneth, that the flesh of our Lord being in heauen, is not on earth neither visibly nor inuisibly; otherwise there should be no correspondence betweene these two propositions, nor no consequence in his discourse.

¶ *Si Verbi
& carnis una
natura est,
quomodo cum
verbum ubique
sit non ubique
inuenitur cor-
poris? nā quan-
do in terra
fuit, non erat
ubique in cae-
lo, & nunc
quia in caelo
est, non est ubi-
que in terra.*

Theodoretus disputeth against the same heretickes, in his first Dialogue entituled *Immouable*, where he saith, *¶ The Lord gave the name of his bodie to the signe.* Nothing can be more expressly spoken.

There also he calleth the signe his blood.

And a little after he saith, *¶ Iesus Christ honoured the visible signes with the names of his bodie and of his blood, not hauing changed their nature, but hauing added grace to nature.* Every word in this sentence is of great force.

In the second Dialogue, the *Eutychian* hereticke maintaineth the changing of the substance of the bread into flesh after consecration; thereby to inferre, that in like manner after the incarnation of the Word, the flesh was changed into the diuine substance. But see what *Theodoretus* saith against it: *The mysticall signes do not change their nature after conse-*

cratation.

creation: for they remaine and continue in their first substance, figure and forme, and are visible and palpable as before; but they are understood to be those things which they are made to be, and are beleaved and reuerenced as being made that which they are beleaved to be. So Gensian Hernet and Bellarmine translate it, and also the Greeke is cleare and manifest; and Theodoretus meaning cannot be otherwise expounded: for he disputed against an hereticke which affirmed that the substance of the bread and wine were changed in the Sacrament. But Theodoretus contradicting him, maintaineth necessarily that the substance of the bread and wine still remaineth. Adde hereunto that there being question to shew that after the incarnation the substance of the flesh of our Lord remained, Theodoretus should haue spoken very improperly and against himselfe, if to shew it, he should haue alledged, that the substance of the bread being changed, the accidents and the apparence of bread remained. That had bene as much as if he had pleaded the Eutychians cause, that would haue, that the substance of the flesh of Christ being changed, the apparence thereof did remaine.

In like sort Gelasius in his book of two Natures saith, "And yet the substance and nature of bread and wine ceaseth not to remaine still. And certainly the image and resemblance of the bodie and of the blood of Christ are celebrated in the action of the mysteries."

Chrysostome* in his 82. Homilie vpon Saint Matthew saith, When Iesus Christ gaue the mysteries, he gaue wine.

Chrysostome, or whosoever is the author of the imperfect worke vpon Saint Matthew, in the eleuenth Homily saith, "If it be a sinne and a dangerous thing to put the sanctified vessels to priuate uses, as Baltazar teacheth vs, who drinking in the sacred cups, lost both his kingdome and his life: if, I say, it is so dangerous a thing to put those sacred vessels to priuate uses, where in the true bodie of Iesus Christ is not, but the mystrie of his bodie is therein contained, how much more the vessels of our bodies? It is to no purpose to say, that the Arrians did corrupt that booke: for the Arrians had no other opinion tou-

Et tamen esse non desinit substantia vel natura panis & vini. Et certe imago & similitudo corporis & sanguinis Christi in actione mysteriorum celebrantur.

* Pag. 300. edis. Cornel. infra in uerbis amplius dicitur amplius

** Si ergo hac uasa sanctificata ad priuatos usus transferre sic periculosum est in quibus non est uerum corpus Christi, sed mysterium corporis eius continetur quanto magis uasa corporum nostrorum, &c.

ching that point, then those that hold the orthodoxall and true faith.

Saint *Macarius* the Egyptian in his 27. Homily saith, In the Church bread and wine is offered, being the figure of his flesh and of his blood: and those that participate in that bread which is seene, spiritually eate the flesh of our Lord.

Maximus which hath made notes vpon *Denis* falsly surnamed the Areopagite, saith, *αὐτοὶ τὰ τὰ ἐν αὐτοῖς, Τὰς* things are signes, and not the truth.

Not to be too tedious, for a man might set downe a thousand such places, I will content my selfe with the producing of certaine Councils. In the volume of the Canons of the Councils of Africa, the 37. Canon saith, *Ἔς τὸ τέλος (ὡς ὁ* Lord himselfe hath taught vs) *ἵνα ἐν τῇ ἁγίᾳ λειτουργίᾳ, μὴ προσφέρωμεν ἄλλο τι πλὴν τοῦ σώματος καὶ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ κυρίου, ὅτι ἐστὶν, ὡς ὁ κύριος ἐκέλευσε, ἵνα προσφέρωμεν ἅρτος καὶ οἴνου μεμιγμένου.* Here by the ordinance of a Council, the exposition of these words, *My bodie and my blood*, is set downe, that is, bread and wine mixed with water. And the same Canon is repeated in the Council of Trulle, Canon 32.

In like sort the 2. Canon of the Council of Ancyra forbiddeth Deacons that had sacrificed to idols, any more to present the bread & the cup. And the last Canon saue two of the Council of Neocesarea, forbiddeth Priests of country villages to give the bread and the cup in the presence of a Bishop, or of a Priest of a towne.

The Council of Constantinople holden anno 756. composed of 338. Bishops, condemning images, expressly speaketh of this Sacrament, saying, *Βεβόηται ἡ εἰκὼν τοῦ σώματος καὶ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ κυρίου, ὅτι ἐστὶν ἡ εἰκὼν τοῦ σώματος καὶ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ κυρίου, ὅτι ἐστὶν ἡ εἰκὼν τοῦ σώματος καὶ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ κυρίου.* And a little after: *Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς ἐκέλευσε ἵνα μὴ ἐπὶ τῇ τράπεζᾳ εἰσθῇ εἰκὼν τοῦ σώματος καὶ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ κυρίου, ἀλλ' ὁ ἅρτις καὶ ὁ οἶνος μεμιγμένοι.* A place which the second Council of Nice authoriseth by condemning it. For nothing was pleasing to that abominable Council, but that which displeased God.

It is a mockerie to say, that the Fathers spake in that manner,

mer lest they should be vnderstood by the Catechumeni, seeing that both their Sermons, and their bookes, and the Councils are not expressly made for the Catechumeni, but for all the faithfull. And it is not credible that the Fathers speaking to the faithfull, would lye for feare of offending the Catechumeni, which would haue bene much more offended, if they had vnderstood that the Fathers had told the faithfull one thing and them another. Much lesse is it to be beleeued, that if the consecrated hoast be Iesus Christ himselfe, that the Pastors of the Church would haue perswaded the Catechumeni that it is not so, seeing that at this day they make little children beleue it. I know that the Fathers spake of the mysteries of faith with more sobrietie before the Catechumeni; but it is one thing to speake to the Catechumeni, and another thing to write and preach to the faithfull, as the Fathers in these places do.

Let vs adde hereunto the ancient customes. The Christians in Saint Pauls time made a banquet in the Church, wherein they did eate the remainder of the Sacrament. In many places they gaue that which was left to little children: and in other places they burnt the rest of the sacred bread which was left. Saint Ambrose in the booke of Widowes teacheth vs, that in his time they vsed women to administer the bodie of our Lord: and yet he speakes of widowes. A thing which at this day would be held to be prophane, and which indeed would be very inconuenient, if that which were given them to beare and administer were the true and naturall bodie of the Sonne of God. Then also they gaue the Sacrament into the hands of the people, and sometimes they suffered them to carrie it home to their houses. * Satyrus brother to Saint Ambrose, hung it about his necke, and swam therewith. Things which would neuer haue bene suffered if they had beleued that the bread had bene the true bodie of Christ. Also at that time they spake not of concomitance, nor of putting the whole bodie into euery drop of wine in the cup, nor of accidents without substance, nor of a bodie without a place. They vsed no elevation or lifting vp of the host, and the people reuerenced

Hier. in 1. ad
Corinth. c. 11.
Eusebius lib.
4. in stor. cap.
35.

Nicephorus
lib. 17. cap. 29.
Hesych. in Le-
uit. lib. 2. cap.
8. Eusebius li.
7 cap. 8.

Augustinus
contra literas
Pelagian. lib.
2. cap. 23.

Oporret eam
carere varia-
rum illecebris
voluptatum,
ut corpus
sanguinem
Christi minis-
tret.

* Ambrosius
oratione de
obitu fratris
Satyri.

the symbols and the signes, but adored not the Sacrament as God. They adored Iesus Christ in the action of the Eucharist, not as being inclosed in the bread, but as being in heaven at the right hand of God. And the consecration of the bread was not made by these words, *This is my bodie*, but by prayer. *Iustin Martyr* at the end of his second Apologie, called that which they receiued in the holy Supper, *A meate consecrated by the prayer of the Word proceeding from God*. S. *Augustine* in his fourth Chapter and third booke of the Trinitie, saith, *That which is taken from the fruits of the earth and consecrated by mystical prayer*. *Theodoretus* alledged before, bringeth in the Hæreticke speaking in this manner, * *The signes of the bodie and of the blood are one thing before the innocation made by the Priest, but after innocation they are changed, and made other things*. *Origen* in his 8. booke against *Celsus* saith, * *We eat soanes of bread, which by prayer are made a bodie, which is some holy thing*. *Basil* in his booke of the holy Spirit, cap. 27. if that booke be his, calleth τὰ τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἑῷματι ἐν τῷ ἀναδέχῃ τῷ ἁγίῳ, *The words of the innocation when they shew the bread*. Which shewing of the bread was not done by lifting vp a round wafer ouer the Priests head, but by drawing of curtaines which hung betweene the table and the people: as Saint *Chrysostome* saith, in his third Homilie vpon the Epistle to the Ephesians. Then consecration was done before they said these words, *This is my bodie*, which Pope *Innocent* the third acknowledged, as we haue already shewed.

That which deceiueth many men, is diuerse bookes falsely attributed to the ancient Fathers, as the booke of the Supper of our Lord attributed to Saint *Cyprian*: the Catecheticall Prayers of *Gregorie Nissen*: the Catechesis Mystagogieke placed at the end of *Cyrils* Catechisme: and diuerse the like false bookes, which were not brought forth till many yeares after the death of the authors of whom they beare the name, the style and doctrine whereof wholly repugneth the authors to whom they are attributed.

With the like abuse they produce the Oratorie amplifications of certaine Fathers in their Homillies, where they speake of

of chewing and grinding the flesh of the Lord betweene their teeth, of thrusting their fingers into his wounds, of embracing his crosse, of making the altar red with the blood of our Lord: of hote coales brought with tongues by Seraphins, &c. Excessive speeches vsed to rauish the spirits of the auditors, and such as if a man presse according to the letter, would bring in a thousand absurdities.

But that which they stumble most at, is, that oftentimes in the ancient Fathers that which is receiued in the Eucharist is called the bodie of Christ, and that they say that the Priest with his sacred mouth maketh the bodie of Christ. But he that hath read the ancient Fathers, knoweth that they make two sorts of the bodie of Christ, one that was crucified for vs, the other which is receiued in the Eucharist, whereof the last is eaten by the faithfull, but the other can not be eaten with the mouth. Saint *Jerome* upon the Epistle to the Ephesians saith: * *The flesh and the blood of Christ is vnderstood two wayes, either that spiritual and diuine flesh, whereof he himselfe saith, My flesh is meate indeed; or that flesh which was crucified, and that blood which was shed by the souldiers speare. And the same Father in the second Distinction of Consecration saith:* * *We are permitted to eate of that host which is wonderfully made in remembrance of Christ. But it is not lawfull for any man to eate of that same host which Christ offered vpon the tree of the crosse.*

Saint *Augustine* oftentimes speaketh of eating the bodie of Christ: but to the end that men should know that it is another bodie then that which was crucified, writing vpon the 98. Psalm, he produgeth Iesus Christ speaking in this manner: *You shall not eate this bodie which you see, neither shall you drinke the blood which those that shall crucifie me shall shed. What body then do they eate? He expoundeth it himselfe and saith: I haue recommended a Sacrament vnto you, which being taken spiritually will giue you life.*

So before we heard *Origen* call the bread of the Eucharist, the symbolicall bodie of Christ; and a bodie which in some sort is an holy thing, to discerne it from the naturall bodie. And S.

Cyprian

* 2. De Consecr. Can. Dupliciter intelligitur caro Christi, vel spiritualis illa, etque diuina de qua ipse ait, caro mea est verus cibus, vel caro ea quae crucifixus est, & sanguis qui militum effusus est lancea.

* Can. De hac quidem hostia quam Christus commemorat, iam mirabiliter fit, edera licet. De illa vero quam Christus in ara crucis obtulit, secum dum se nulli edera licet.

*" Si vinum
tantum qui
offerat, san-
guis Christi
incipit esse fi-
us nobis, si ve-
ro aqua sola
fit, plebs inci-
pit esse sine
Christo.*

Cyprian in his third Epistle of his second booke saith, *" Corpus Domini non potest esse farina sola, nec aqua sola: The bodie of our Lord cannot be weale alone, nor water alone; because meale must be kneaded with water.* There also he will haue water to be mix- ed with wine, because wine is the blood of Christ, and water the people; for that the blood of Christ must not be without the people.

Ephraem whom we haue before alledged, saith, that the bodie of Christ which the faithfull receiue, loseth not his sen- sible substance, euen as water in Baptisme is still water. It is clearer then the day light, that by the body of Christ, he vn- derstandeth not the naturall bodie of our Lord, seeing he ma- keth that bodie in the Eucharist to be the same that water is in Baptisme, that is, an externall signe. And Ephraem should in vaine say, that the naturall bodie of Iesus Christ doth not lose his substance in the Eucharist; for who euer imagined that the naturall bodie of our Lord loseth his substance in the holy Supper, or ceaseth to be a man?

The same also appeareth by this, that the Fathers oftentimes speake of peeces or parts of the body of Christ which are gi- uen to the people in the Eucharist, which can not be said of the crucified body.

So in the Canon, *" Comperimus*, in the second Distinction of Consecration, Pope Gelasius complaineth of some that ha- uing taken a part of the body of Christ, abstained from the cup.

Gregorie Nissen, in his booke of Baptisme, saith that the con- secrated bread is no more common bread, but is called, and is, the bodie of Christ. But he declareth how it is bread, and yet is the bodie of Christ, by the similitude of the water in Baptisme, and of the stones of an altar, which are of the same nature that others are, but become holy by blessing. By these examples he manifestly excludeth transubstantiation. The place is long and worthle to be read.

This being so, it will not be very hard to perceiue how S. Ambrose will haue the bread still continuing bread, neuerthe- less to become the body of Christ by diuine vertue. Which he declareth in the fourth Chapter of the fourth booke of Sa- craments,

*" Comperimus
quid quidem
sumpta pan-
is, non de co-
muni sacri-
poris sacri-
poris a ca-
liis sacra-
mentis absti-
nere.*

craments, where he propoundeth this question, *Hoc igitur* *astruamus quomodo potest qui panis est, esse corpus Christi: Let vs* *show how that which is bread, may be the body of Christ.* By which question it appeares that he will haue it bread and Christs body at the same time. And thereupon he produceth diuerse workes of God, whereby he hath made things to be that which they were not. And so inferreth, that by great reason God can make things that were, to be the same still, and yet to be changed into other things. His words are these. *Si ergo* *tanta vis est in sermone Domini Iesu, ut inciperent esse que non erant, quanto magis operatorius est ut sint que erant, & in aliud commutentur?* Then if there be such vertue in the words of our Lord, to make those things that were not to begin to be, how much more can he make those things that were before, to be the same that they were, and yet be changed into another thing? He will haue the bread to remaine bread, and neuertheless to be the body of Christ.

Howbeit, such kindes of speaking haue bene stumbling blocks at which the ages ensuing haue stumbled, specially since the holy Scriptures haue bene hidden from the peoples and that men to aduance themselves aboue Angels, haue boasted that they make God with words, & create their Creator.

An answer to the Profopoeia of M. Arnaud.

Now I thinke we shall easily answer *M. Arnaud* Profopoeia, in which he prescribeth God what he should say, and makes God demand of vs at the latter day, why we haue contradicted his foure Euangelists? why we quarrell with his Church? and why we haue placed a figure in stead of the truth? He ought rather to examine himselfe, and to thinke how he shall make answer vnto God: and what reason he will yeeld vnto him for making himselfe to be an aduocate of a doctrine cleane contrary to the Gospel? Why he hath sung Masse in stead of administering the holy Supper of the Lord? Why he hath intruded himselfe to sacrifice the bodie

34. Sol.

of our Lord without commandement? Why he hath vsurped the office of a sacrificing Priest not ordained by Iesus Christ? Why he hath lifted vp an host in the Masse to cause it to be adored as God, seeing that Iesus Christ vsed no such elevation, nor the Apostles any adoration? Why he hath sung particular Masses without communicating, or any assistants, seeing that the Apostle calleth the Supper a communion? and that the Lord communicated to all the assistants? and that the word *cena*, signifieth a common supper? Why he did not communicate the cup vnto the people, seeing Iesus Christ said, *Drinke ye all of this*? Why he speaks in the Masse in an vnknowne tongue not vnderstood by the people, contrary to the example of Iesus Christ? Why he turnes his backe to the people, seeing that Iesus Christ in the Eucharist turned his face vnto his disciples? Why in saying Masse he prayeth for saluation by the merits of those Saints whose bones are hidden vnder the altar, seeing that Iesus Christ caused not any dead bones to be layed vnder the table? and that saluation is not gotten or obtained by mens merits? Why the Euangelists hauing said that Iesus Christ brake, and gaue bread, he hath taken vpon him to teach, that the Priest doth not breake nor giue bread in the Masse? Why Iesus Christ hauing said of that bread which he gaue, that it was his bodie, he hath taught that that bread is no more bread, but becommeth the bodie of Christ? Why he durst belie the Apostle Saint *Paul*, who foure times saith, that we breake and eate bread? Why, seeing that the holy Sacrament is instituted for the remission of sinnes, he hath winked at the prophanation thereof vsed in the Church of Rome, to say Masse for horses, & sicke hogs, and to sing particular Masses to draw soules out of Purgatorie, if they be rich mens soules that haue giuen something to the Church? What can these venerable Doctors answer hereunto? Will they say, Lord, the Church hath iudged otherwise, and hath found it conuenient to change the institution of this Sacrament, and his Vicar the Pope may dispence against the Apostles, and against the Gospell, in giuing it interpretations. Do they thinke that such excuses will

will be admitted in that fearefull iudgement, or that thereby they can defend themselves from the heate of that fire that shall consume the aduersaries?

But these repugnances, in such things which are the grounds and the very essence of this holy Sacrament, and which make part of the action, are other matters then such as they object against vs, when they aske vs, Why we do not celebrate the holy Supper after supper; why we do it not in an high chamber, and why we admit women vnto it? They ought to adde hereunto, and aske vs, Why we are not apparelled like Jewes, and why we do not celebrate it only vpon a Thursday, and after we haue eaten a Lambe? Which are ridiculous questions, made to exempt themselves from answering to their corruptions, which destroy the whole nature of Sacraments. Among the which the taking away of the cup from the laitie requireth some large discourse.

*Of taking away the Cup in the holy Supper, or of the
Communion under one kind onely,*

1. Our Lord giving the Cup to his disciples, said vnto them, *Drinke ye all of this.* The Church of Rome correcteth that, and saith, *Thou shalt not all drinke thereof,* for to drinke at the Masse is the priuiledge of Priests, and of Kings and Princes.

35. Sect.

2. They make answer and say, that Iesus Christ spake onely to Pastors, for all those that then were present were Pastors of the Church. But the Church of Rome giuing the Cup to Kings and Princes, sheweth that she doth not beleue that that commandement was made onely to Pastors of the Church.

3. Moreouer, Iesus Christs disciples being with him, were not as Pastors, but as sheepe and disciples, and in that action are also called disciples.

4. It is manifest, that in the institution of the Supper, the
com.

commandement to eate and to drinke was indifferently made to those persons that were present. And if the people are not bound to communicate in the cup; because those to whom Iesus gaue it were Pastors; by the same reason the people may dispense with themselves touching the participation of the bread, vnder pretence that those were Pastors to whom Iesus Christ said, *Eat*. And so there is nothing in the whole institution of the Sacrament which bindeth the people to receiue any of the two kinds; nor yet at all to participate this Sacrament. What is he that can iudge or discern that these words of our Lord, *Take, eat*, are directed to the Pastors and to the people; but that those words *Drinke ye all of this*, are onely directed to Pastors? There is nothing then in the institution of the Supper which directeth the faithfull; and yet the institution of a Sacrament is the rule it selfe. And though we looke elsewhere for the commandement to eate made to the people, we shall alwayes finde that there also is mention made of drinking.

5. Our aduersaries themselves confesse, that Iesus Christ by these words, *Do this in remembrance of me*, commanded his disciples to do the same to the faithfull that he did to them: He commanded therefore to giue the cup to the faithfull.

6. Besides, our Lord administering the cup, said, *That it is the new Testament in his blood, which is shed for the remission of sinnes*. Then it appeareth, that to deprive the people of the cup, is as much as to deprive them of the shedding of his blood for the remission of sinnes. For our aduersaries say that there is no effusion of blood in the host.

7. And when Iesus said, *This is my body which is given, and broken for you*, did he vnderstand that it should onely be giuen for Pastors, or broken for their saluation, and not for the saluation of the people? And if it be impious to affirme that touching the bodie, why should it be lesse impious to be said touching the cup?

8. S. Paul. 1. Cor. 11. cutteth off all euasions; for he writeth to the Corinthians, and as he himselfe saith, cap. 1. verse 2.

to all those that call vpon the name of Iesus, and saith vnto them, *Let a man examine himselfe, and so let him eate of that bread, and drinke of that cup.* Euen as the commandement to examine himselfe is made to all the faithfull, so the commandement to eate of that bread and to drinke of that cup, is made to all the faithfull. He saith not (as some affirme) *Examine your selues before you drinke.* The Greeke hath *isdisu*, *Let him eate*, which is the Imperatiue moode; and a word of commandement, and not a conditionall word, *if he will eate, or when he would eate, let him examine himselfe.* If the King ordained that a souldier should arme himselfe, and that he should fight courageously, he commandeth him to arme himselfe and to fight; so when the Apostle saith to the faithfull, that they should examine themselves, and that they should eate and drinke that bread and that wine, he commandeth them both to examine themselves, and to eate that bread and drinke that wine. And if the Apostle had said no otherwise, but that the faithfull must examine themselves before they drinke, he would presuppose thereby that the faithfull dranke, and that in Corinth the people participated in the cup.

9. It is true, that it sufficeth to receiue one of the *species* vnworthily to make a man culpable; whereupon the Apostle saith, *Whosouer shall eate this bread, or drinke this cup of the Lord vnworthily, shall be guiltie of the body and bloud of the Lord.* But that hindereth not the faithful from participating both in the one and the other kinde. Yet I am not of opinion, that a man that taketh one of the *species* vnworthily, can take the other worthily.

10. But the nature of falshood specially appeareth in this; that it contradicteth it selfe. For when Iesus Christ, Iohn 6. said, *Except you eate the flesh of the Sonne of man, and drinke his bloud, you haue no life in you*, our aduersaries expressly affirme and maintaine, that Iesus Christ spake of the Eucharist, and of eating with the mouth: treading the authority of Pope Innocent 3. vnder their feete, that determined the contrary, as we haue shewed before. Howbeit by this they make a proffesse against themselves, and testifie, that as much as in them lyeth,

lyeth, they deprive the people of life eternall. For it is said,
If you drinke not, you haue no life in you.

Their answer is, That the blood is also in the host, and that in taking the body we take the blood also. This libertie is horrible. For to take the blood vnder the host, is not to drinke; but Iesus Christ commandeth vs to drinke, saying,
If you drinke not, &c.

If to take the drie host, is to drinke, we must say that the Priest drinkes twise in the Masse, once when he takes the host, the other when he takes the cup. Which discovereth the childish subtiltie of those that say, that Iesus Christ in this place of Saint *Iohn* doth not expresse the manner how to communicate, but sheweth the substance of the thing. For he speaketh of drinking, and drinking is the manner of communicating. Is there any hope euer to bring these men to reason, that play with the word of God, and perceiuing themselves to be grounded, haue their recourse to such ridiculous defences, as to maintaine that to eate the host, is to drinke? If we take eating and drinking for beleeuing (as Iesus Christ in this Chapter expoundeth it) it is certaine, that to eate and to drinke are all one thing. But betweene eating the Sacrament with the mouth, and drinking, there is great difference.

11. Adde hereunto, that he which taketh the blood vnder the host, taketh it not as being shed for vs, nor with the Sacrament of the shedding of his blood, which is the manner whereby Iesus Christ will haue euery man to participate in the same. The faithfull in eating the bread may remember the shedding of his blood, but God will haue the memorie and the exterior signe to go together. And we must not content our selues with the memorie, to abolish a part of the Sacrament, because it is instituted to celebrate the memorie of the shedding of the blood. For, if the memorie of the shedding of the blood were sufficient without participating in the Sacrament of the shedding of the blood, we might also dispencc with our selues for participating in the Sacrament of the bodie, for that the preaching of the word might refresh our memories therein.

12 The ambition of the Clergie hath begotten this monster. ^a For by giuing the Cup to none but to Priests and to Kings and Princes, Priests haue made themselues companions with Kings: in the same manner as the Pope hath exalted himselfe aboute the Clergie, in disdaining to drinke out of the Chalice, and sucking by drops out of a quill which is put into the Cup, and giuing the rest to the Deacon. A custome which hauing bene practised in the latter times by some ambitious Prelates, is now reserved for the Pope onely, for a marke of his greatnesse. ^b Gerson in his second Treatise of the Communion vnder both kinds, puts this among the causes why the people should be deprived of the Cup, to wit, that thereby the dignity of lay men would be equall with the Priests. Their onely intent therefore herein is the honour and exaltation of the Clergie.

^a Lib. 2. Sacramentorum Ceremoniarum cap. 14. Episcopus Cardinalis porrigit calicem quem Papa ponit in calice in manibus Diaconi existentes, & sanguinis partem sumpsit. ^b Tanta esset dignitas laicorum circa assumptionem corporis Christi sicut & sacerdotum.

The Councell of Constance holden anno 1416. which is the first Councell that forbad the Cup to be administred to the people, vpon paine of heresie, and punishment to be imposed by the secular powers, confesseth that Iesus Christ did institute the holy Supper vnder both kinds, and that the primitiue Church did so practise it. Neuerthelesse it saith, that the contrary custome ought to be holden for a law; and declareth all those to be heretickes and punishable which contradi& it. You shall see the whole Canon, which (as error loueth darkness) those Fathers haue purposely obscured, promiscuously handling it with the question touching the receiuing of the Eucharist after Supper. The words of the Canon are these:

Seeing that in some parts of the world, some men dare rashly affirme, that Christian people ought to receiue the Sacrament of the Eucharist vnder both kinds, and ordinarily giue the Communion to the laitie, not onely vnder the forme of bread, but also vnder the forme of wine, and that after supper, or otherwise not fasting; and obstinately affirme that it must be so communicated contrary to the laudable custome of the Church, reasonably brought in; which they damnably seeke to reprove as sacrilegious. For this cause this present sacred generall Councell of Constance, lawfully assembled by the holy Ghost, against this error, seeking to provide for the

At m

saluation

saluation of the faithfull, after ripe deliberation had by diuerse Doctors as well spirituall as temporall, declareth, decreeteth, and defineth that although Iesus Christ after Supper did institute and administer to his disciples this venerable Sacrament vnder the formes of bread and wine; notwithstanding, the authoritie of the sacred Canons, and the commendable and approued customes of the Church haue declared, and do declare, that this Sacrament ought not to be celebrated after supper, nor by the faithfull to be received but fasting, vnesse it be in case of weaknesse or other necessities permitted by law or by the Church. And likewise, that although in the primitive Church this Sacrament was received by the faithfull vnder both kinds, neuertheless this custome hath with reason bene induced, that it should be taken by those that consecrate, vnder both kinds, and by the laitie vnder the forme of bread onely. For that we must constantly, and without any doubt beleene, that the whole bodie and bloud of Iesus Christ is truly contained as well vnder the forme of bread, as vnder the forme of wine. Therefore, seeing that this custome hath bene reasonably induced, and long time practised by the Church and by the holy Fathers, it must be holden for a law, which it is not lawfull to reprove, or to change at our fantasies without the authoritie of the Church. Therefore to affirme, that to obserue this custome or law, it is sacriledge or an unlawfull thing, that opinion ought to be held to be erroneous; and those that obstinately affirme the contrary of that which is said before, ought to be banished as hereticks, and grieuously punished by the Diocessane of the places where they reside, or by their Officials, or by the Inquisitors of hereticall perversities, &c. To speake in this manner, what is it else but to spit in the face of the Sonne of God, and to tread the Gospell vnder their feete?

*An examination of the Reasons alledged by
our Adversaries.*

36. Sect.

To maintaine this error against the word of God, they alledge certaine weake reasons of humane wisdom: as if mens reason might contrary the Gospell; or as if our aduersaries

ries were sharper sighted then Iesus Christ, or as if they could propound some inconuenience which Christ did not foresee. *Gerson* that was at the Councell of Constance, propoundeth the reasons that moued the Councell to prohibite the Cup vnto the people.

1 He saith, that there would be danger lest any drop of the wine should fall downe vpon the ground. But he should rather beware lest he fall into disobedience, or to suffer the authoritie of the word of God to fall downe.

2 He saith, that it is done lest the common people should wet their beards in the cup. But it were better that men were without beards then without the Sacrament of the bloud of Iesus Christ: and yet women and yong men without beards might communicate without danger.

3 As also lest the Chalice being kept, should take wind, or waxe sower. But that is to take great care for Iesus Christ. For if he be present and whole in euery drop of wine within the Cup, his presence would be sufficient to keepe the wine from sowing: seeing that (if you belecue our aduersaries) the milke of the virgin *Mariæ* waxeth not sower, nor the bones of Saints putrifie in so many hundred yeares. To speake nothing of this new Philosophie, which giueth vs sharpe lines, puffed vp in length and breadth.

4 They also alledge, that thereby the Church of Rome sought to stop another heresie. But we must not remedie one euill by another, nor an error by an abuse: neither shall it euer be found that the prohibiting of the chalice did remedie any error, but onely that it serueth to strengthen the error of Transubstantiation.

5 They likewise say, that some countries haue no wine. I answer also, that there are countries that haue no bread; and that if men can carry the one thither, they may carry the other also: or if that be impossible, it is better in such a country to vse that which serueth there in stead of bread and wine, rather then to be wholly or in part deprived of the Sacrament. And that if there be such a countrey whereunto men cannot carry wine, the same discommoditie happeneth as wel to the Priests

as to the people. Adde hereunto, that if some countries cannot haue wine for the Sacrament, it followeth not but that they may be furnished from an infinite number of other provinces where they may haue wine. This consideration is as badly grounded, as if I should say, that we must not heare the word of God, because those that are deafe cannot heare it: that so in matter of instruction to saluation, there may be no difference among men.

6 Lastly, our aduersaries (as they suppose) find examples in the new Testament of celebrating the Eucharist without the Cup. Put case that such examples were to be found, what would that make for them? For the question betweene vs is not, whether the holy Supper may be administred without the Cup; but, whether the Cup being there, the Priest alone, and not the people, ought to drinke? Therefore they vainly alledge the 2. of Acts, 42. verse, where it is said, that *they continued stedfastly in the Apostles doctrine, and fellowship, and in breaking of bread, and in prayer.* And Acts 20. 7. where it is said, that *the disciples came together to breake bread.* In these places it is not said, that there was a cup whereof the Pastor dranke and the people dranke not. And if vnder pretence that in these places there is nothing spoken of drinking, it followeth that the people should not drinke; it will follow thereby, that Pastors also ought not to drinke; for there is nothing spoken in those places of them touching that.

It should be a ridiculous consequence, if I should say, that in the 31. of Genesis it is said, that *Jacob* invited his brethren to eate bread with him, and therefore that they dranke not. It is the ordinary manner of the Scripture, by bread to vnderstand all that is set vpon the table at meale times. Gen. 37. 25. Luke 7. 36. and often in other places. And there is no reason why this manner of speaking should not be allowed in a sacred Supper as well as in a common repast. So there was no beast sacrificed vnder the Law without some asperision of wine, and yet in all the sacred historie, where it is said that such a king or Priest did offer sacrifice, there is nothing spoken of sprinkling of wine. For, as to know how men ought
to.

to celebrate sacrifices, we need not seeke in Histories or examples, but we must go to the rules thereof contained in the bookes of *Moses*: so to know how the Sacraments ought to be celebrated, we must not haue recourse to examples summarily recited, but to the rules, and to the first institution thereof.

In Pope *Gelasius* time, that liued in anno 493. this abuse began to spring vp, against the which the said Pope pronounced this sentence, saying: *We haue bene aduertised that some persons hauing onely taken a peece of the sacred body, do abstaine from the Cup of the sacred blood, who without doubt (because it is said that they are led by I know not what superstition) ought either to receiue the whole Sacrament, or to be wholly excluded from communicating: because the diuision of a Sacrament cannot be done without great sacriledge.* Note these words, should be driven away: that men should not thinke that he spake onely to Pastors.

grīs arceantur, quia diuisio vniū eiusdemque mysterij sine grandi sacrilegio non potest promoueri. Thereupon the Glosse saith, *Hoc intelligo de conscientie, nam infirmus vel sanus in necessitate sine vino corpus sumere potest.*

* Dist. 2. De
Consecr. Can.
Comperimus
quod quidam
sumpta tantummodo corporis sacri-
porione à calice
sacramenti
abstineant.
Qui procul-
dubio (quoniā
nescio quā su-
perstitione di-
cuntur astrin-
gi) aut inte-
gra Sacramē-
ta percipiant
aut ab inte-

A meanes of agreement.

Some men desirous of peace, and calling to minde the great quantitie of blood that hath bene shed, and the miseries and desolations that haue happened among Christians, the wounds whereof still bleed, and whereon at this day men power vineger and not oyle, will say vnto themselues, Is there no meanes of reconciliation? is the mischiefe so desperate? Certainly the agreement is very easie, and to be made by so iust and easie meanes, that no man can contradict it without making open warre against God, and declaring himselfe to be degenerated from the blood of his brethren, whom Iesus Christ redeemed with his blood. For all men confesse, that Iesus Christ did institute the holy Sacrament as it should be,

37. Self.

and that there is nothing to be contradicted therein. Then let the Pope restore the holy Supper to the same forme that Iesus Christ did institute it; let men speake in this action as Iesus Christ spake; let them do as he did, without further disputation, and then we will willingly assemble together with them, that we may with one accord glorifie God. If that were done, there would be no Masses without communicants; the Service would not be done in a strange language; all men should communicate vnder both kindes; there should be no adoration nor lifting vp of the host; neither should the Priest, bowing himselfe vpon the altar, require remission of sinnes from God by the merits of the Saints whose bones are hid vnder the altar. But the aduocates of the Masse are growne to such a pride and contempt of the Sonne of God, that they presume that the Church of Rome doth better then Iesus Christ, and that many things are wanting in his institution: alledging to that effect the saying of the Apostle Saint Paul, 1. Cor. 11. 34. *And the rest will I set in order when I come.* But the Apostle saith not, that he would change any thing in the Lords institution, or that he would establish any thing contrary to that which the Sonne of God had commanded. He speaketh not of essentiall things, nor of that which God hath commanded or prohibited, as adoration, Service is an vnknowne language, propitiatory sacrifice, the communion of the faithfull, and the participation of the Cup, which are essentiall points in religion, and wherein if we would conforme our selues after the example of Iesus Christ, we should be at an agreement. The Apostle speakes of circumstances, and of exterior order, which concernes comeliness and not necessitie, as the Councell of Trent acknowledgeth; for which things we would not strue, so the substance might remaine, and that humane constitutions were not made equall with Gods institution.

*Trid. Concil.
Sess. 21. cap. 2.*

THE XXXIX. ARTICLE:

Of the Confession of the Faith.

We beleue, that God will haue the world to be gouerned by lawes and policies, that there might be some restraint of the disordered desires of the world. And as he hath established kingdomes and commonwealths and all other kinds of principalities, whether they be hereditary or otherwise, and all that belongeth to the state of iustice, and will be knowne to be the author thereof: so hath he put the sword into the Magistrates hands, to repress sinnes, committed not onely against the second table of the Commādements of God, but also against the first. Therefore in regard of him, we must not onely endure and suffer superiors to gouerne, but also we must honour and obey them with all reuerence: holding them for his Lieutenants and officers, whom he hath appointed to exercise a lawfull and an holy charge.

THE XL. ARTICLE.

We say then, that we must obey their lawes and statutes, pay all tributes and imposts, and other duties, and beare the yoke of subiection with a good and free will, although they be infidels. So that Gods Empire may flourish and be vndefaced. And therefore we detest those that would reiect superioritie, and establish communitie of goods, and ouerthrow all course of iustice.

38. *Self.*

Vpon the 30. Article of our Confession, wherein we speake not any thing of Kings nor Magistrates, *M. Arnoux* speaketh of vs, as of those that are enemies to all humane order, and which teach men to shake off the yoke of lawes and Magistrates. But against these two Articles, wherein we speake of subiection and fidelity to Magistrates, as of a necessary thing ordained by God, he saith nothing, and so iustificieth vs by his silence. Either because our innocencie is knowne vnto him, and our Confession touching this point so expresse, that it confuteth all sorts of slanders: or because he hath bene stricken with some remorse of conscience, and is ashamed to speake any thing in this matter for the obedience due to Magistrates, knowing well that the Popes power; and the doctrine of the Iesuites wholly tend to the subuersion of Empires, exempteth Clergie men from the subiection of Kings, and putteth the liues and the Crownes of soueraigne Princes into the Popes power. Which moueth vs to speake briefly of these two things: First, of the exemption of spirituall persons from temporall power: Secondly, of the Popes power to giue and take away kingdomes.

Of the exemption of the Clergie.

39. *Self.*

a Laici in
clericos nullā
habent iuris-
dictionem &
potestatem.
b Persona-
rum Ecclesia-
sticarum im-
munitas Dei
ordinatione &

The Councell of Constance in the 31. Session, declareth, that ^a *the Laitie* (that is to say, Kings and Princes) *have no iurisdiction nor authoritie ouer Clergie men.* The Councell of Trent in the 25. Session and 20. chapter saith, that ^b *The exemption of Ecclesiasticall persons was instituted by the ordinance of God, and by canonicall constitutions.* Bellarmine in the eight and twentieth chapter of his booke of Clerkes, saith, ^c *That Clerkes may not be punished by the ciuill Iudge, nor by any means be brought before the iudgement seates of secular Magi-*

canonicis sanctionibus instituta est. c Clerici non possunt à Iudice politico puniri, vel alio modo trahi ad secularis magistratus tribunal,

strates.

strates. And in the same place he saith, * *The soueraigne* * *Summus*
Bishop hath exempted Clerkes from the subiection of Princes, *Pontifex cl-*
and therefore Kings are no more Soveraignes ouer Clerkes. *ricos exemit a*
if our Kings and their Courts of Parliament do referue any *subiectione*
iurisdiction to themselves ouer the Clergie, as Appeales, their *Principum; nō*
regall right vpon vacant Benefices, tythes, and the patronage *sunt amplius*
of certaine Benefices, then the Clergie rage, and cry out, and *Reges Clerico-*
say that they violate the liberties of the Church. For the liber- *rum superiores*
tie which Iesus Christ hath obtained for the Church, which
consisteth in her deliuerance from the ceremonies of the Law,
and in her deliuerance from the seruitude of sinne and the
diuell, at this day is conuerted into an exemption from all
subiection to Magistrates, and into franchises and temporall
immunities. And if the Magistrate taketh any knowledge of
a crime committed by any Clerke, and layeth hand on him to
punish him, (as not long since it happened in Venice,) it is
enough to thunder downe an Estate, and to threaten a Com-
mon wealth to interdict it. And not to seeke for more proofes
of so manifest a thing, the Pope yearely on Maundy Thursday
thundreth out an excommunication against Kings and Magi-
strates that shall take any knowledge of the crimes and causes
of Ecclesiasticall persons, or that shall raise any tythes of the
Clergie. This is it which is called the Bull de Cæna Domini,
wherin all cases referred to his Holines are orderly set downe.

These exemptions are a great p̄iudice and weakening to our Kings; partly in respect of the multitude of persons that are withdrawne from the obedience of the King, which haue their Iudges and their prisons apart, and whose causes are carried to Rome by Appeale: and partly in regard of their goods and possessions; for the Clergie possesseth the third part of France, and the goodliest peeces of ground and houses, vpon which the King loseth his right. For a s̄ceffe entring into the possession of the Clergie falleth into a Mortmaine, and oweth no more personall seruice to the King, to aide him in his necessitie: and in case of high treason, his goods cannot be confiscate, nor his person punished, if it pleaseth not the Bishop to degrade him, that he may become a lay man, and so punish-
 able:

able by the secular power. By this meanes the Pope hath erected an Estate téporall for himself in the middle of the Estates of Christian Kings. From hence it proceedeth that our Kings in a great kingdome raise small armies, and that the Clergie waxing fat, the Nobilitie and the third estate become poorer: as the armes and the legs waxe weake when the belly swelleth with excesse; which causeth the head (which is the soveraigne Prince) to draw the lesse service from them. Therefore it is not without cause that many yeares since Ecclesiasticall persons haue hidden the Scripture from our Kings, because it speaketh so expressely touching this matter.

1 In the old Testament the Priests and the Leuites were subiects to Kings. It was not in the high Priests power to punish Leuites with corporall or pecuniarie punishment.

2 King *Dauid* in the first chapter of the first of Kings calleth *Sadoc* the high Priest and *Nathan* the Prophet, his seruants, saying, *Take with you the seruants of your Lord, and let Sadoc the high Priest and Nathan the Prophet anoint him there King ouer Israel.*

3 In the second chapter, verse 26. King *Salomon* putteth *Abiathar* from the office of high Priest, and confineth him to Anathoth. And the actions done in the beginning of *Salomons* reigne are generally commended in the third Chapter, verse 3.

4 In the 17. of Saint Matthew Iesus Christ payed tribute, and Saint *Peter* with him. It cannot be said that he did it for feare, seeing he had power enough to exempt himselfe from it. It is true that being of the royall race, he had bene exempted from paying tribute, if he had bene acknowledged in that quality, as he himselfe saith in that place, *That the children of Kings are free.* But knowing that he could not alledge his royall descent to the collectors of tribute without offending them, he subiected himselfe thereunto, in that giuing vs an example to conforme our selues to do the like.

5 He himselfe appeared before *Pilate* as before his lawfull Iudge, and to whom that power was giuen from aboue, loh. 19. 11.

6 The Apostle Saint *Paul* appealeth to *Cesar*, and not to *Peter*. Which he did not for feare, for he would not by feare prejudice the right of the Church: nor by fraud, for Saint *Luke* Acts 23. 11. witnesseth, that he did it by the motion of the Spirit of God, the Lord appearing vnto him in the night. Wherefore *Bellarmino* much wrongs himselfe, to say, that Saint *Pauls* cause was for a point of religion, the knowledge whereof appertained not to the Magistrate. For in Acts 24. *Tertullus* accused *Paul* to haue raised sedition, and Saint *Paul* 25. 8. defendeth himselfe, by alledging that they accused him to haue offended *Cesar*.

Cap. 3. in
Barkl.

7 The Apostle Saint *Peter* in his first Epistle writeth to all the faithfull, and by consequence to Pastors of the Church. And therefore to them it is that in the 2. chapter and 13. verse he saith, *Submit your selves to euery ordinance of man for the Lords sake, whether it be to the King as supreme, or vnto Gouerners, as vnto them that are sent by him.*

8 But Saint *Pauls* words, Romans 13. 1. are most expressely set downe to that end, where he saith, *Let euery soule be subiect vnto the higher powers, for there is no power but of God, the powers that be are ordained of God. Who soeuer therefore resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God.* And lest some Sophister should thinke to auoide this, by saying that Clerkes or spirituall persons are subiects to the Pope, and that he in respect of them is the superiour power; the same Apostle in the fourth and sixt verses sheweth that he speaketh of the power which beareth the sword, and whereunto tribute is payed. But then, and long time after that, there was no superiour power which bare the sword, and to whom men payed tribute, but the power of secular Princes. The interlineat Glosse confesseth it, where vpon these words, *Potestatibus sublimioribus*, the Glosse saith, *id est, secularibus bonis & malis*. And it is to be noted, that then *Nero* reigned, a Pagan Emperour, who as he was the greatest, so he was the wickedest of all men, and a persecutor of the Church, to whom neuerthelesse S. *Paul* would haue Christians yeeld obedience. Therefore *Chrysostome* in his 23. Homilie vpon the Epistle to the Romans, expoundeth that place.

under the yoke of
the lawe, as
the apostle saith,
yea although thou art
an Apostle, or an
Evangelist, or a
Prophet, or what
soever thou art.

place in this manner, saying: *He commandeth that to all men, both to Priests, and cloyster men, and not onely to secular persons: yea although thou art an Apostle, or an Evangelist, or a Prophet, or whatsoeuer thou art.*

9 And to the end that men should not say, that feare of punishment, or present necessitie drew those words from the Apostle, he saith that we must be subiect to the higher powers, *Not onely because of wrath*, that is, not onely because we are afraid to offend the Prince, *but also for conscience sake.* And in the second verse he saith, *Whosoever therefore resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God.*

10 It is either in despite or in mockerie, that *Bellarmino* in the 28. chapter of his booke of Clerkes, for the exemption of Clerkes alledgeth an example of the Egyptian Priests, that were not constrained to sell their lands through pouerty, as the other Egyptians were. For, doth it from thence follow, that their lands and possessions were exempted from tallages or tributes? and say they had bene so, may a Pagan example serue for a law in the Church of God?

11 Reason also is most euident herein. For is it reasonable that the King should pay souldiers that go to warre, and that he should fortifie the frontiers of his kingdome, to the end that Clerkes and spirituall persons may sleepe securely, and that they should not contribute something towards his charge?

12 And being borne French men, and subiects to the King, why should that naturall subiection be defaced by their shauing? Or who can suffer that a French man, borne in France, of French parentage, should not be subiect to the King of France? and that in temporall things he should acknowledge another Soueraigne out of the Realme? and so be exempted from the commandement vnto which God in his word bindeth all Christians?

13 This also is clearer then the day, that Christian religion doth not deprive any man of his goods, nor of that lawfull power which he had before he was conuerted to the faith. All men confesse, that while king *Clouis* reigned, and
was

was a Pagan, and all men generally were subiects vnto him, in all the countries contained within his kingdome. Then why should his conuersion to the faith depriue him of a part of his power, and exempt a part of his subiects (that is, spirituall persons) from being punishable by secular Iudges?

14 And seeing that the soueraigne Prince ought to foresee as much as possible he may how to preuent all disorders that happen in his Realme, how can he do it, if one part of those that liue in his Realme, and which possesse great wealth, are no subiects vnto him? Shall he without remedie therein taken, suffer certaine Clergie men to corrupt the good manners of his subiects? or that they should haue secret intelligence with strangers? or that they should conspire treason against his life or against his State? And if a Bishop being accessarie to the same crime, will not degrade a Clerke, shall he go unpunished?

15 The examples which *Bellarmino* produceth to defend this cause, sufficiently shew what we must iudge of these exemptions. For in that the Pope separateth marriages, and exempteth children from the obedience of their parents, he inferreth that he may also exempt Clerkes from due obedience to their soueraigne Princes. That is to say, that the Pope may disanull the rule of Saint *Matthew* 19. 6. which saith, *What God hath soyned together, let no man put asunder:* And exempt children from the commandement of God, which saith, *Honour thy father and thy mother, &c.* And, *Children obey your parents in all things, for that is well pleasing vnto the Lord,* Coloss. 3. 20.

16 To say that Celgie men haue receiued these priuiledges from the liberalitie and courtesie of Princes, is to contradict the Pope and *Bellarmino*, who maintaine that the Pope hath exempted Clerkes from this subiection, and that he may do it without asking counsell of any Prince. You must also know, that as a father cannot exempt his sonne from obeying the commandement of God, who will haue children to honour their fathers and mothers, and obey them; so a Prince cannot exempt one part of his subiects (as long as they dwell

in.

in his realme) from subiection to punishment for their faults, seeing that subiection is ordained by the word of God.

17 To say that Clerks ought voluntarily to subiect themselves to the lawes and governments of Magistrates, but if they do otherwise, that they may not be punished by the Magistrate, is as much as if a man should say, that lawes are no lawes to them. A law without punishments added thereunto, is onely a counsell. It is a commandements with a condition to do nothing vnlesse we will our selues. Men ordinarily disobey lawes, notwithstanding prescribed punishments: how much more then will they disobey them when they feare not to be punished?

*Of the Popes power ouer the Crownes and liues of Kings
and Princes, and ouer all the temporalities
of kingdomes.*

40. *Scit.*

Popes for the space of 550. yeares, haue attributed power vnto themselves to dispossesse Emperours and Kings of their kingdomes, and to dispence with their subiects from keeping and obseruing their oathes of fidelitie to their Princes, and to haue power both ouer spirituall and temporall Magistrates.

*a Platina,
Helmslow,
Abbas Stan-
densis, Vpper-
gensis, Signi-
nini, Fasciculi
temporum, Si-
giberum, Nau-
clonus, Lan-
guin, &c.
b Mai, Paris
p. 215. & 223.
c Westmo-
nasteriensis.*

Gregory the 7. ^a first drew out this sword against the Emperour *Henric the 4.* whom he deposed from the Empire, but to his owne hurt, and his to whom he transferred the Empire, that was *Rodulphus* Duke of Sweeland, that died of a wound giuen him in his hand; and *Gregorie* being driuen out of Rome, for griefe thereof died at Salerne.

Anno 1212. *Innocent 3.* ^b deposed *Iohn* king of England, and gaue his realme to *Philip Augustus* king of France, vpon condition to conquer it at his owne cost and perill. After that he absolved the said king *Iohn*, vpon condition that he should become the Popes vassall, and hold his kingdome in fee of the Church of Rome, and that he should yearly pay a thousand marks of silver in signe of subiection.

The Councell of Latran holden anno 1215. vnder the same Pope,

Pope, in the third Chapter, * giueth the Pope power to absolve subiects of their oathes of fidelitie made vnto their Lords, and to giue their lands to other Catholicke Princes.

Anno 1191. as *Baronius* declareth; the Emperour *Henrie* the sixth came to Pope *Celestine* the third, and fell downe at his feete. At which time the Pope with his foote spurned the Emperours Crowne from off his head, to shew, that it was in his power to take the Empire from him, and to pull off his Crowne.

c Significatur hoc summo Pontifici ut ex tunc ipse vassallos, et eius fidelitate denunciet absolutos, et terram exponat occupandam.

Anno 1245. *Innocent* the 4. in an open Councell holden in Lions, deposed the Emperour *Fredericke* the second, and would neuer accept of any submission nor reconciliation. And since *Gregory* the 7. vntill *Lewis* of Bauiere, to who the Empire entirely fell, for the space of 260. yeares there was nothing but deposing and excommunicating of Emperours, valesse it were those that maintained themselves by force, from whence ensued infinite bloudie warres, more then an hundred maine battels, and an innumerable number of townes taken and sacked.

Anno 1302. Pope *Boniface* the 8. wrote arrogant letters to *Philip* the Faire king of France, whereby he declared that king *Philip* was subiect vnto him in temporall things: that no collation of Benefices belonged vnto him, and that all those that spake against it were heretickes. And resistance being made by *Philip*, the Pope gaue his kingdome to the Emperour *Albertus*, vpon condition to conquer it. What answer *Philip* the Faire made, and how he reuenged himselfe, every man knowes.

See Paulus
Æmilius and
Nicolas Giles

Anno 1511. Pope *Iulius* the second deposed *John Albert* king of Nauarte, and gaue his kingdome to *Ferdinand* king of Castile, who seized vpon it, and his successors still hold it. Our good King *Lewis* the 12. was likewise thundred at, but he ouerthrew the Pope and his adherents in a battall at Ra-uenna; and at Pisa assembled a Councell against the Pope, causing certaine crownes of gold to be stamped with this superscription, *Perdam nomen Babylonis*.

Alexander the sixth, gaue the West Indies to the Spaniards, and

and the East Indies to the Portugals, placing the Meridian which passeth by the Azores, for their limits.

*Sanderus
alij plerique
mobiles Catho-
lici fress Bal-
la Pij Quin-
ti in Hiber-
nia contra
Anglia Regi-
nam bella pro
patria & reli-
gione gerunt.*

Pope *Pius* the 5. pronounced a sentence of degradation and deposition against *Elizabeth* Queene of England, and caused Ireland to rebell against her, as *Gensbrard* writeth, an. 1581. of his Chronicle, saying, *Sanders and other Catholickes war-anted by a Bull made by Pope Pius the fifth made warre in Ireland against the Queene, for their countrey and for religion.*

With the like iniustice *Henrie* the third king of France, hauing bene depofed by *Sixtus* the fifth, and excommunicated, was not long after killed by *Iaques Clement* a Iacobin.

Anno 1592. monitorie Bulls were sent from Rome by Pope *Gegorie* the 14. into France, whereby King *Henrie* the fourth was declared incapable of the Crowne of France; which Bull (by a Decree made by the Court of Parliament then resident in Tours bearing date the 5. of August,) were torne in peeces and burnt by the hand of the common executioner.

The Pope pretends that he may depose soueraigne Princes for heresie, as he pretended against Queene *Elizabeth*, and *Henrie* the fourth late King of France deceased: Or for being ypholders of hereticks, as *Henrie* the third: Or for want of capacitie, and weakenesse of spirit. So Pope *Zacharius* in the Canon *Alim*, in the 15. Cause and 6. Question, boasteth, that he depofed *Chilperic* for incapacie, and translated his kingdom to *Popin*. Or for violating the priuiledges of Monasteries, as it is declared in the pretended priuiledge of the Abbey of Saint *Medard* in Soissons, which is added to the end of the works of Pope *Gregory* the first. Or for attributing vnto themselves the collation of Prebends and Benefices, which was the cause for which Pope *Boniface* the eight put downe *Philtp* the Faire, and gaue his Realme to *Albertus* the Emperour.

*Theodorat, lib.
2. lib. cap. 16.*

By this meanes affaires haue bene much altered: for before this vsurpation, Emperours depofed and punished Popes, as subiects to their Empire.

The Emperour *Constantius*, sonne to *Constantine* the Great, draue *Liberius* Bishop of Rome, out of Rome, and banished him to Berce, and put *Felix* in his place, giuing *Liberius* siue hundred

hundred crownes to maintaine himselfe in his banishment.

Anno 430. the Emperour *Honorius* draue *Boniface* and *En-laius* competitors for the Bishopricke, out of Rome, and not long after called *Boniface* thither againe.

Theodoricke a Goath, King of Italie, sent *Iohn* Bishop of *Platina*. Rome Embassador to the Emperour *Iustinian*, and after calling *Sigebert*. him home, caused him to die in prison.

Bellizarus Lieutenant to the Emperour *Iustinian*, anno 538. draue *Silverius* Bishop of Rome out of Rome, and set *Digilis* in his place, who by the Emperour *Iustinians* commandement came to Constantinople, where he was honorably receiued, but not long after the Emperour being offended with his bold speeches, made him to be beaten till he was almost dead, and to be drawne with a rope about his necke through the Citie like a thiefe, as *Platina* reciteth. The things following are recited by *Nicophorus* in his 16. booke, and 17. Chapter.

Anno 654. the Emperour *Constantine* caused Pope *Martin* to be bound in chaines, and banished him to Chersona, where he died.

In the times of these Emperours the Popes payed 20. crownes for their inuestitures to the Emperour as to their Prince, as we may see by *Iustinians* Authenticke 123. cap. 3. The Emperour *Constantine le Barbu* released this tribute to Pope *Agathon*, anno. 679.

And since the Emperours of Constantinople lost Italie, the successors of *Charles* the Great draue away and punished diuerse Popes. Anno. 963. the Emperour *Othon* draue *Iohn* the 13. out of the Papacie. Anno. 1007. *Henrie* the second deposed 3. Popes, *Benet* 9. *Syluester* 3. and *Gregorie* the 6. whom *Platina* calleth three horrible monstres.

From these excommunications & degradations of Kings, spring the enterprises against their liues. The excommunication sent out against *Elizabeth* Queene of England was seconded by many conspiracies against her life. From the deposition of *Henrie* the 3. by *Sixtus* 5. ensued the parricide

Nn

commit-

This Oration was printed at Paris by Nicholas Nivelle, and Relin Thierry, with approbation of three Doctors, Boucher, de Crail, and Ancelin.
 a. Si Papam deponat ab illis tantum poteris expelli vel interfici quibus ipse id commiserit.
 b. 2. of King. chap. 11.
 c. Hoc tamem temperamento ut in hac quidem dispositione licebit, si non ipse qui permittitur veniens haurire cogatur quo intus modulis concepto pereat. Sed exterius ab alio adhibeatur, nihil adinuante eo qui permittendus est, minime cum tanta res est veneni resilla eo aut vestre delibuta non interficiendi habeas.

committed by *Jacques Clement*, for the which the said Pope gaue thanks to God in open Consistorie. His oration was put in print by our aduersaries. And the Iesuite *Mariana* extolleth that fact as an heroicall act, worthy of great commendation. *Bellarmino* openly approueth such murderers of Kings in the 7. Chapter of his booke against *Burkley*, saying, *The Popes were wont to absolute their subiects of their oathes of fidelitie, and, if need were, to deprive them of their regall authoritie, touching the execution it belongeth to others.* * And the Iesuite *Suarez* in the 4. Chapter of his 6. booke against the King of great Brittain, saith, *If the Pope deposeth a King, he may not be driven away nor killed, but by those to whom the Pope shall giue order to do it.* But if the Pope deposeth a King without giuing expresse commission to kill him, in that case (he saith) it belongeth onely to his lawfull successor if he be a Catholicke, or if he will not do it, it belongs to the common people to do it. And generally all our aduersaries that write in the defence of the Popes power ouer the Crownes and temporall iurisdictions of Kings, ^b as *Bellarmino*, *Beccani*, *Francis de Verona*, *Suarez*, *Ribadneria*, *Gretzer*, *Eudemon-Iohanner*, and *Emannell Sa*, &c. alledge the example of *Queene Athalia*, deposed and slaine by the commandement of *Ioiada* the high Priest, and maintaine that the Pope hath the same power. Therefore the iudgement of the Court of Parliament of Paris pronounced against *Iohn Chastel*, that condemned this doctrine to be hereticall, and tending to the subuersion of kingdomes, was censured at Rome; to the which censure was ioyned the storie of the late President of Thou, and of certaine bookes of *Mariana*, wherein he speaketh of monies, without once mentioning the booke which he wrote of the institution of a King, in the which the murder of Kings is approoued.
 c Neuerthelesse with this moderation, that it is better to poyson a Tyrant in his chaire or in his clothes, (therein imitating the Kings of the Moores) then to poyson his drinke or his meate, lest that Tyrant should be culpable of killing himselfe, and that so it might be preiudiciall to his saluation. For with a great example of humanitie or mercie these fathers haue

haue a care of the soules of those whose bodies they cause to be killed.

To support this bloody doctrine, they note certaine maxims of diuellish diuinitie, ⁴As that it is better to suffer a King to be slaine, then to reueale a confession: That the Pope may dispense with the accomplishing of an oath made to God: * That the Lord gaue to Saint Peter, and by consequence to the Pope, power to make that which is no sinne to be sinne, and that which is sinne to be no sinne, which is Cardinall *Bellarmines* maxime in his booke against *Barkley*, cap. 31: That to kill a King that is deposed, is not to kill a King, but a particular person: ⁵ That being taken, it is lawfull to vse equiuocations before a Iudge to escape punishment: That a religious person ought to obey his Superiour with a blind obedience, that is, without iudging whether it be good or euill: That a man must not keepe faith and promise with one that is excommunicated: That he is not a murderer that killeth an excommunicated person, as Pope *Urban* saith in the 23. Cause and 5. question: ⁶ *We esteeme them not to be murderers, who being possessed with Zeale towards our mother the Catholicke Church against those that are excommunicated, shall chance to kill any of them:* ⁷ That the sentences, decrees, and iudgements of Iudges that are excommunicated are voide and of no authoritie: That the Pope either directly or indirectly is Lord of all the temporall possessions of kingdomes: That being Pastor he may shut vp and destroy furious Rams, that is, Kings which are not obedient vnto him: ⁸ And also that he hath power ouer infidell and Pagan kings, although for certaine considerations he doth not vse that power. These are propositions whereof the writings of the Iesuites are full, and which the Iesuites of France haue oftentimes bene moued and solicted to condemne, and to write against them, but neuer could be induced thereunto.

Some, (as the Cardinall *du Perron* in his oration made to

^h *Toletus lib. 1. de Institutione Sacerdotali cap. 13. Excommunicatus non potest exercere actum iurisdictionis absque peccato: Immo si publica est excommunicatio facta, sententia nulla sunt.*
ⁱ *Bellarmin. in Barkl. cap. 21.*

d Eudamon.
in Apol. Gar-
neti. c. 13. &
Suarez trac-
tatu de Parni-
sentia: Nullū
tantum potest
esse malum
cuius vitandū
causa cōfession-
em prodere
liceat.
e Bellarmin.
in Barklaium
cap. 13. In bo-
no sensu Chri-
stus dedit
Petro potesta-
tem faciendi
de peccato non
peccatum, &
de non peccato
peccatum.
f Toletus lib.
4. de Institut.
sacerdotali c.
58.
g Canone ex-
communicato-
rum. Nō enim
eos homicidas
arbitramur
quos aduersus
excommunicato-
res, zelo ma-
tris Catholice
Ecclesie ar-
dentes, aliquos
vorum cruci-
fasse contige-
rit.

The States in Paris vpon the 15. of Iannarie, 1615.) do not finde it good that Kings should be killed, but allow that the Pope should depose them: which is all one; for, to pronounce the sentence of deposing against a King, is as much as to condemn him to die, because (as they say) from the time of his deposing he is no more a lawfull King; but is held to be an vsurper. Now every vsurper of a kingdome may iustly be killed. *In rebus Malefictis & publicis hostes, omnis homo miles est:* so saith Tertulian. Take from a King the title of a lawfull King, and you take that from him which is the defence of his life, which may easily be taken from him by euery man: that is carelesse of his owne life. Adde hereunto, that euery King which is deposed, seeketh meanes to vphold his honour, to retaine the government of his Countie, and to defend himselfe against those that make any attempt against his Crowne: In this publicke confusion the King incurreth a thousand dangers, and exposeth his person to the hazards of warre. And there are not many soueraigne Princes found that haue suruiued in their Empires or haue preserved their liues when they lost their Crownes. For a King is set in an high place, from whence he descendeth not by degrees, but falleth downe headlong. And he that dispossesseth him, goeth against all rules of humane wisdom, if he suffereth him to liue whom he hath deprived of the Empire, who without doubt will seeke to lay hold vpon that which he hath lost. Then whosoever he be that will not haue Kings killed, but will haue them deposed, speaks as if he should say, Let vs not kill them, but let vs disarm them: that they may be killed. Let vs not take their liues from them, but let vs take the meanes from them to saue their liues. Let vs not kill him while he is a King, but let vs depose him; for by that meanes, he that shall kill him shall not kill a King. These things are full of contradictions, and are very weakely set together: As the King of Great Brittain hath excellently well shewed in his Declaration against the said Cardinall, whereby he did that to the said Prelate, which the Pope doth to the new Cardinals the first day of their sitting in Consistorie; * at which time the Pope stoppeth their mounthes; but herein

* Looke touching this ceremonye the 1. booke of Sacred Ceremonies, Sect. 9.

herein is the difference, that the Pope openeth their mouths againe at the next Consistorie following, but that great and wise King stopt the Cardinals mouth ** for euer, and in that matter put him to perpetuall silence. He did sufficiently condemne himselfe in his Oration, by saying, that for the same cause he was ready to suffer martyrdom; and yet it is a question not decided by the Scripture, nor by any Councils, and the Pope himselfe suffereth it to be accounted Problematicall, (that is to say, doubtfull and vncertaine:) from whence it followeth, that the martyrdom which one should suffer for such a cause, would be problematicall and vncertaine.

But that which is most hard and intollerable in this matter, is, that our aduersaries confesse that the Pope may erre in his iudgement, and depose an innocent King: and yet they will haue that King which is so vniustly condemned, to be peaceable, and not to contend, but to leaue his kingdom, and to stay till the iustice of his cause shall be tryed. It is *Bellarmines* speech in the 17. and 31. Chapters of his booke against *Barkley*. For he presupposeth that the new King that shall haue seised vpon the kingdom, will not put the deposed king to death, but finding him to be innocent will receiue him againe, and reestablish him in his kingdom. What is this, but as much as if a man should spit in Kings faces, and leade them about like buffons, by adding euident laughter and mockerie to iniustice?

To support this doctrine, which trampleth vpon the maiestie of God in the persons of his anointed and his Lieutenants, our aduersaries gather together a great number of places in the Scripture, as first, the Lord said to *S. Peter*, *Feed my sheepe*: Therefore the Pope may thrust Kings out of their thrones. And *Saint Peter* saying, *Here are two swords*; the Lord said, *It is enough*. And God said to *Jeremie*, 1. Chap. 10. verse, *I haue this day set thee over the nations and over the kingdoms*. And *Saint Paul* said, 1. Cor. 2. 15. *The spirituall man iudgeth all things*: this spirituall man is the Pope. And God said to *Saint Peter*, *What soeuer thou vnbindest on earth shall be vnbound in hea-*

the said Cardinal liued three yeares and a halfe after the publication of the King of great Britains booke * Cap. 31.

Quod autem dicit iniustam sententiam non ledere eum in quem fertur, verum est quando is in quem fertur eam humiliter tolerat, et obseruat, donec iniustitia vel potius nullitas manifeste se prodatur. Cap. 17. Si forte Princeps spiritualis abutatur potestate sua iniuste excommunicando Principem temporalem, vel eius subditos sine iusta causa ab eius obedientia absoluen- do, peccabit Princeps spiritualis, sed non poterit tamen Princeps sibi sumere iudicium de spiritualibus rebus, aut spiritualis Principis iudicare.

men. Therefore the Pope may discharge subiects of their subiection which they owe to their Prince. In the beginning of Genesis it is said, that *In the beginning God made heauen and earth. It is in principio, and not in principij,* to shew that there is but one beginning, which is the Pope. These are of private use, *All things are giuen vnto me of my Father,* Matth. 11. 27. And *All power is giuen vnto me in heauen and in earth,* Matth. 28. 18. And the diuels said, *If thou wilt cast vs out, send vs into the fire, that we may enter into them,* Mark. 5. 12. By this the Pope may dispose of temporall kingdomes. For it is said, Iohn 12. 31. *And I, if I be lifted vp from the earth, will draw all men vnto me.* Therefore the Pope being exalted, ought to draw all temporalities to himselfe. And see other places which are hard to be answered: Iesus Christ said to Peter, *Put forth into the sea, and cast out the net.* And he saith, Luk. 19. 30. *You shall finde a colt tyed whereon neuer man sate, loose him and bring him hither.* S. Paul 1. Cor. 9. saith, *Hane we not power to eate and to drinke?* Ergo, the Pope may dispose of all temporall rhipps, and put Kings from their thrones. With such places of Scripture the Popes and their Champions establish their Empire. Time is too precious to stand long to confute these childish proofes, which are not fit to be proposed but with the sword in hand. To propose these things is to refute them, and it is not credible that any man will receiue or allow of these proofes, but he that willingly will be decciued.

Cardinall du Perron was ashamed of such allegations, and would not produce them in his Oracion, but he alledged others which were no better then they. He said that the Prophet Samuel deposed King Saul, that the Prophet Abia deposed King Roboam: That Azarias the high Priest draue King Osius from the gouernment of the Realme: That S. Paul said to the Corinthians, that it is a shame for Christians to be iudged by Iudges that are infidels. All which allegations are false, and by the Kings Maiestie of great Brittain are manifestly and clearly confuted.

That this power of the Pope over the Crowmes of Kings, and over the temporalities of kingdomes, is contrary to the word of God, and to all reason.

1. In this point if we will beleue and giue credit to the Scriptures, the controuersie is ended. There were many idolatrous Kings in Iudæa, as *Achas* and *Manasser*, against whom the high Priests did not pronounce any sentence of deposition.

41. *Sall.*

2. The Prophet *Ieremie* 27. 12. saith, *Bring your neckes vnder the yoke of the King of Babylon, and serue him and his people, and line.* He will haue the Iewes to serue a Pagan King, as established by God. Conformable to that which *Daniel* 2. 37. saith, speaking of the same King, *Thou o King art a King of Kings, for the God of heauen hath giuen thee a kingdome, power, and strength, and glorie.*

Nero was a monster in nature, the shame of humane kind, and the first Emperour that began to persecute the Church. Neuertheless the Apostle *Saint Paul*, *Rom.* 13. speaking of that power which then was in being, saith, that it was ordained by God, and that whosoever resisted the same resisted the ordinance of God. *Cardinall du Perron* in his Oration seemeth to perswade, that this commandement was but by prouision and for a time. Which is a meanes to auoide all the commandements of God, and to dispence with them when he will. He should at least haue shewed how long that prouisionall commandement continued, and at what time it began to bind mens consciences no more. This doth wrong the ancient Christians, and bereaueth their sufferings of the title of martyrdom, seeing that by his assertion they yeilded to the violence of Pagan Princes, not to obey a necessarie and certaine commandement of God, but a prouisionall rule, made for a time, till the Church hauing recouered force by multitude of people, might shake off the yoke of their soueraign Prince. And thereby the Apostle is accused of hypocrisie, for teaching Christians to faine and dissemble, commanding them to be subiects to the Emperour, not thereby to obey God, but to accommodate themselves to the time,

and to yeeld to present necessitie. All this is confuted by the same Apostlie in the same place, where he saith, That we must be subiect to the Prince, not onely because of wrath, that is, for feare to incur his displeasure, but also for conscience sake,

* This ceremonie is described in the 1. booke of Sacred Ceremonies Sect. 3. cap. 3.

Compare Iesus Christ paying tribute to *Cesar*, with the Pope which maketh *Cesar* pay tribute vnto him, and bindeth him to lay a quantitie of gold at his holinesse feete, that day when he setteth the Crowne vpon his head. Compare Iesus Christ counselling the Iewes to pay tribute to a Pagan Emperour, with the Pope that dispenseth with subiects touching their obedience to Christian Emperours and Kings: And Iesus Christ saying, that his kingdome is not of this world, with the Pope which hath erected a worldly Empire for himselfe. Compare Iesus Christ, who being on earth, had power to destroy and overthrow all Monarchs of the earth that were enemies to God, but would not do it, with the Pope, that hath no power to giue nor to take away kingdomes, but yet will do it, and attributeth a power vnto himselfe which he cannot execute: And Iesus Christ refusing to be arbitrator in a controuerisie for an heritage betweene two particular persons, with the Pope, which intrudeth himselfe to be Soueraigne and absolute Iudge of quarels betweene Princes, and distributer of kingdomes.

Luke 12. 14.

Exod. 20.
Psal. 119.

Adde to this the rule of the word of God, which forbiddeth periuie, and will haue vs to keepe our promise although it be vnto our owne hinderance. To the which commandment it is better to obey, then to the Pope, that boasteth that he can dispense with oathes made vnto God: wherein he doth manifestly exalt himselfe above God. For he that can dispense with a seruant for obeying of his maister, is greater then his maister. And hereby it will be found, that God shall not be serued nor obeyed, but in such manner as the Pope will permit, and that if by the Popes permission any man be faithfull towards God, God is beholding to the Pope, because he provideth him seruants, and such persons as are faithfull vnto him. Therefore to obey God, those Officers who at the entrance into their offices tooke oathes of fidelity to their Kings,

Kings, must be faithfull to the Pope, what thunderings and inducements soeuer to rebellion shall happen to come from Rome to overthrow the Realme. If they reply and say, that by suffering a King that is an hereticke to reigne, Catholicke religion incurreth great danger: I answer, that oftentimes the Pope taketh on him to depose Kings that are of his owne religion. Was it for heresie that *Henry* the 3. King of France was deposed? Was it for heresie that *John Albert* King of Nauarre was dispossessed and depriued of his kingdom by *Iulius* 2? & so of the Emperours *Henrie* the 4. and *Fredericke* the 2. and of *Philip le Bel*, and *John* King of England, & diuers others. And although true religion should be persecuted by a king that is an hereticke, yet we must not remedie an euill by a sinne, nor defend pietie by disloyaltie. God hath no need of our vices to defend his cause. The preseruacion of true religion is Gods cause, and his worke, which he will not abandon nor forsake. When humane meanes seeme to faile and decay, he watcheth and taketh care for the preseruacion of his Church: and if he will afflicke it, we must humble our selues, and when he will deliuer it from danger, we neede not bring periurie and sedition to aide him, as if he had no other meanes to do it.

This also passeth all absurditie, to imagine that *Saint Peter* and the Bishops of Rome after him, had power to depose the Emperor *Nero* or *Domitian*. Without doubt those Emperours that knew not that there was a Christian Bishop in Rome (so poore and miserable were the said Bishops) are excusable for not acknowledging and honouring those Bishops as their superiours in temporall things, and who had power to thrust them out of their Empires.

But why did not those Bishops aduertise the Emperours of the authoritie which they had ouer Empires, that so the Emperours might not pretend cause of ignorance? Why did not the Bishop of Rome depose those Emperours when they violently persecuted the Church? Was it because they would vse courtesie and clemencie vnto those poore Emperours? but that clemencie had bene crueltie towards the Church. Was it because they feared the power of those

Emper-

Emperours? So it may be said, that the obedience which they yeelded to their soueraigne Prince, was done by dissimulation and by force. Adde hereunto that *Tertullian* in the 37. Chapter of his Apologie, and *Cyprian* against *Demetrius*, say, that in their times every place was full of Christians that were able to defend themselves, and that they held the greatest part of the Empire of Rome, and yet did not defend themselves against the violence of those Emperours. In the time of the Emperour *Julian* the Apostata, three parts of the Empire were Christians, and his armies were composed of Christians, and yet the Bishop of Rome did not thinke vpon deposing him from the Empire. The same Bishop also did not pronounce sentence of deposition against the Kings of the Gothes that were Arians, reigning in Spaine, nor against the Kings of the Vandals that were Arians, reigning in Africa; although they were farre distant from Rome, and that the Bishop of Rome had no cause to feare their forces.

Who will beleeue that Iesus Christ gaue Saint *Peter* and his successors a charge for so many yeares together, without power to execute it? and that he gaue them a sword to hang vp a thousand yeares together against the wall, and neuer to be drawne out but of late yeares? Is it credible, that the Popes began first to know the nature of their charge, then when their Sea or seate fell into all manner of vices, as the greatest flatterers of the Pope confesse and acknowledge? seeing also it is euident and knowne by experience, that the Pope neuer began to employ that power, but for his owne profit and thereby increased in riches and greatnesse, neuer giuing any absolution to a Prince, but vpon gainfull conditions for the Pope, as he did to *Henrie* the second, and *Iohn*, Kings of England. But when his thunderbolts cannot preuaile, and that the excommunicated King getteth the victory, then his Holinesse with paternall compassion receiueth him into his fauour, and bestoweth all manner of spirituall benedictions vpon him. As Pope *Clement* the 5. in the Extravagant *Mernis* did, where he commendeth and exalteth the pietie of *Philip* the Faire and of his people, notwithstanding the
hard

hard vsage shewed vnto him by *Boniface* the eight his predecessor.

It is no lesse incredible, that if a Pagan Prince becometh a Christian (as *Clowis* King of France did) he should haue lesse kingly authoritie then when he was a Pagan; and that his conuersion to the faith, should be a diminishing of his power. Yet that is the opinion of the Pope & the Iesuites. For it is out of doubt, that *Clowis* being a Pagan did not acknowledge the Bishop of Rome for his superiour, or that there was any Bishop either within or without his kingdome that could depose him of his Crowne. And if the Pope may change and depose Christian Kings, it followeth that *Clowis* Crowne vpon the day of his conuersion lost the splendor & soueraigne dependance thereof, and began to be in the disposition of another, and that then he began to acknowledge a Superiour in temporall things: which is, to be a Soueraigne no more. By this doctrine it will be hard to perswade a Pagan Prince to become a Christian.

But what reason is there that Kings should be more subiect to the Pope then their subiects are? and that Kings should be hardlier dealt withall then particular persons? For if a subiect of France shall erre in the faith, or commit adulterie, or vse his seruants tyrannously, the Pope neuer to this day durst vndertake to driue him from his house, or to depriue him of his office; then why should a King falling into the like faults be hardlier dealt withall? Why should the Pope haue more power ouer him then ouer other particular men? depriuing him of his Crowne, and by consequence of his life? Is it because the Pope thinketh that our Kings haue lesse spirit or lesse courage then particular persons? Or rather because the Pope abusing Kings in that manner, raiseth himselfe to soueraigne greatnesse, and becometh thereby distributor of Empires and kingdomes?

We haue somewhat largely spoken of this subiect, that euery man may see whether *M. Armon* hath reason to speake of vs as of men that repugne all humane order, and are enemies of al subiection. Our Confession protesteth the contrary, and

and experience iustifieth vs. We neuer attempted any thing against the lliues of our Kings. *Iaques Clement, Iohn Chastel, Ramillac, Garnet, Oldcorne,* and such monsters, and all those who hauing sought to kill the King, and fained madnesse to faue themselves, were not of our religion: but the most part of them were Iesuites or Iesuites disciples. We neuer spake of deposing our Kings, neither belecue that any man liuing in the world can depose a King, or dispense with his subiects touching their oathes of fidelitie. And they that know the truth, will acknowledge, that the reaso which hath moued the Pope and the Clergie to persecute vs with fire and sword, hath not bene so much because we do not beleue Transubstantiation, nor the sacrifice of the Masse, nor inuocation of Saints, as because if we might be beleued, our Kings Crowne should no more depend vpon the Pope: and causes of Benefices and of matrimony should no more be called to Rome, the Realme should be no more tributary, vnder pretence of Annates, Dates, Dispensations, and Absolutions. And French men should runne no more to Rome for pardons, whereby his Holinesse profits would much diminish. Which if we would not meddle withall, he would by speciall priuiledge suffer and permit vs to beleue the Gospell.

*whether the power of Kings, Princes and Magistrates
is ordained by the diuine law of God, or whe-
ther it be an humane ordinance,
as M. Arnoux saith.*

42. Sect.

Thom. 2.2.

Quaest. 10.

Art. 10. Domi-
nium & pra-
latio intro-
ducta sunt ex iu-
re humano. Et

Thomas the chiefe of the Schoolmen, saith that the power of Princes & soueraigne Lords, is but an humane institution, and proceedeth not from God. With whom *Cardinall Bellarmine* ioyneth in his booke against *Barkley*, and *M. Arnoux*, who vpon the 30. Article of our Confession, calleth the power of Magistrates *an humane law*; conformable to the Apoph- thegme of the reuerend father *Binet* the Iesuite, that said to

Quaest. 12. Art. 2. Dominium introductum est de iure gentium, quod est ius humanum.

M.

M. Casaubon, that it were better that all Kings were killed, then to reueale a confession,* because the power of Kings is ordained by humane lawes, but confession by diuine law.

* Casaub. in
Epist. ad Fron-
tonem Ducem
Iesuitam.

** Gen. 11.

The reasons which they alledge for this opinion, are, that the first King that was in the world, that is *Nimrod*,** made himselfe King by force, and not by the ordinance of God. Secondly, that the greatest part of Empires and kingdomes that euer were, were erected by conquest, one nation hauing overcome another, or one Prince moued by ambition, hauing moued an vniust quarrell against his neighbour Prince. Thirdly, that Emperours and Kings are established by humane meanes, whether they attaine to the Crowne by hereditarie succession or by election: seeing there is neither any extraordinarie revelation, nor rule in the word of God, which bindeth a nation rather to follow hereditarie succession then election. Fourthly, that there is no expresse commandement set downe by God to obey *Henric* or *Lewis*, or to acknowledge this or that man more then another to be King. Fifthly, that for these considerations, the Apostle Saint *Peter* calleth the obedience to Kings an humane order, saying, *Submit your selues, to euery ordinance of man, for the Lords sake, whether it be to the King as supreme, or vnto Gouernours, &c.* 1. Pet. 2. 13.

We on the contrary maintaine, that obedience due to Kings and Magistrates proceedeth from the diuine Law, & is grounded vpon the ordinance of God. To that end all the places of Scripture hereafter set down do serue, to shew that God commandeth obedience to Kings and Soueraigne powers, as to those whom he hath established, whom no man may resist without resisting God. *There is no power but of God, the powers that be are ordained of God: who soeuer therefore resisteth the power resisteth the ordinance of God.* Rom. 13. 1. 2 And verse 5. *Wherefore ye must needs be subiect, not onely for wrath, but also for conscience sake.* And S. *Peter* in the same place which they obiekt against vs, will haue vs to yeeld obedience to Kings *for the Lords sake.* And although *Nabuchadnezzar* was an vngodly King, and a scourge vsed by God to destroy nations, neuerthelessse God speaketh thus vnto him by his Prophet *Daniel*, in the 2. Chap-

ter

1. Sam. 10. 1.
and 16. 13.

ter 37. verse, saying, *Thou o King art a King of Kings, for the God of heauen hath giuen thee a kingdome, power, and strength, and glory.* Moses the first Prince and Law-giuer in Israel, was established by the ordinance of God, and *Ioshua* after him. Numb. 27. 18. *Saul* first King of Israel, and *Dauid* his successor were annointed by *Samuel*, and consecrated to be Kings according to Gods ordinance. And 2. Kings 9. 1, 2. God sent a Prophet to *Iehu* to annoint him King of Israel. *He looseth the bonds of Kings, and girdeth their loynes with a girdle, Iob 12. 18. But God is the Iudge, he putteth downe one and setteth up another, Psal. 75. 7. He raiseth the poore out of the dust, and lifteth the needie out of the dunghill, that he may set him with Princes, Psal. 113. 7. 8. And if the prouidence of God extendeth it selfe so farre as to feede birds, and to giue foode to the yong rauens which crie vnto him, Psalme 147. 9. so farre as that he numbred all our haire, so that not one falleth to the ground without his prouidence, who will beleue that when a man is to be placed aboue others, and to be made head and ruler off so many millions of people, that the counsell and prouidence of God doth not therein rule, or that he suffereth things to be done by chance or at aduenture?*

The reasons which they alledge against so euident a truth, halt, and flutter but with one wing.

An answer to
the 5. obiecti-
ons of our
aduersaries.

1. They say, that *Nimrod* the first King in the world attained thereunto by force. But it is false, that before *Nimrod* there was no soueraigne Prince in the world. Before *Nimrod* the fathers and heads of families were Kings, Priests, and soueraigne Princes of their families. For after the flood men liued 5. or 6. hundred yeares. Then it was an easie matter for a man to see 50. yea an 100. thousand persons of his posteritie, ouer whom he exercised paternall power, and by consequence soueraigntie, then when there was no other forme of a kingdome vpon the earth; to whose children their seruants being added, one familie alone made a great commonwealth. Likewise in *Abrahams* time, when mans life was much shortened, we reade that *Abraham* was by the Hethites called a *Prince of God*, that is, an excellent Prince, Genes. 23. 6. And that

that out of his familie he tooke 318. souldiers to go to warre therewith. If you adde his maid-seruants and such seruants as were vsuie for the warre, you must confesse that although he had no children, his familie would haue peopled a towne.

2. They also obiekt, that the greatest part of Empires and kingdomes began by conquest and by force of armes, therefore not by the ordinance of God; and that if the conqueror invaded another mans territories by the ordinance of God, the inhabitants of that countrie had offended God in defending themselves. Whereunto I say, that those whose countries a strange Prince seeketh to invade, do well to defend themselves. And that if in that defensue warre the vsurper chance to be slaine, he is iustly punished. But if he getteth the vpper-hand, if the race of the ancient possessors of the same countrie be cleane extinguished, if the States of the country assembled together do agree vpon a new forme of gouernment, and if all the officers throughout the countrie haue taken their oathes of fidelitie to the new King, then we must beleue that God hath established such a Prince in that kingdom. Then I say, that the people ought to yeeld to the will of God, who for the sinnes of Kings and of their people transporteth kingdomes, and disposeth of the issues of battels at his will and pleasure.

3. It is to no purpose to say, that Princes enter into kingdomes, either by hereditary succession, or by election, which are meanes introduced by custome, & not by the ordinance of God. For the question is not, by what meanes a Prince attaineth to his kingdom, but whether by the ordinance of God we ought to obey him after he is established therein. But our aduersaries will haue the power of Popes to proceed from the ordinance of God, although they enter into the Papacie by election, by indirect courses, by artificiall deuices, and by worse meanes then humane wayes.

4. If there be no commandement in the word of God to obey *Henry* or *Lewis*, it sufficeth that there is a commandement to obey the King, and a commandement to keepe our oathes of fidelitie made to the King, and by consequence to be

be faithfull to that King to whom we sweare obedience and loyaltie. Neither is there a commandement of God to be found that binds vs to obey *Clement* or *Boniface* as Popes, to whom neuerthelesse our aduersaries esteeme themselves to be subiect by the Law of God. If this consideration might take place, it would follow that no man in the world is bound by diuine ordinance to feare God, or to beleue in Iesus Christ, because the Scripture doth not particularly ordaine that *Thomas*, *Anthony*, or *William*, should feare God, and beleue in Iesus Christ. It sufficeth that the word of God containeth generall rules, which bind particular persons without naming them.

5 It is true that *S. Peter* in the place before alledged, calleth the obedience that men owe vnto Kings, an humane order, either because Kings command diuers things which of their owne natures are not deriued from the diuine Law, as the forbidding of knocking by night, or to go by night without a candle; or because they attaine to that power by certaine humane meanes induced by custome: which hinders not but that their power is grounded vpon the word of God after they are once established. For in this question our difference is not touching the meanes whereby a Prince attaineth to a kingdom, but what obedience is due vnto him after he hath attained thereunto. Therefore after *S. Peter* had called that order an humane order, he commandeth vs to subiect our selues thereunto for Gods sake; and so to obey his commandement.

Whosoever buildeth the authority of Kings vpon mens institutions, and not vpon the ordinance of God, cutteth off three parts of their authoritie, and bereaueth them of that which assureth their liues and their Crownes more then the guards of their bodies, or puissant armies, which put terror into subiects hearts in stead of framing them to obedience. Then the fidelity of subiects will be firme and sure, when it shall be incorporated into pietie, and esteemed to be a part of religion, and of the seruice which men owe vnto God.

FINIS.



A TABLE OF THE
MATTERS CONTAINED IN
THE FIRST BOOKE, ACCORDING
to the order of the Sections.

OF the Apocrypha bookes, Sect. 1.	pag. 3.
Of the testimonie which the Church giueth of the Canonickall bookes, Sect. 5.	p. 10.
What the beleefe of the ancient Church was touching these Canonickall bookes, and whether the Church be the infallible Iudge of the sence of the Scriptures, Sect. 6.	p. 12.
Of particular inspiration to interpret the Scripture, Sect. 7.	pag. 18.
Of the interpretation of the Scripture, and whether the Church of Rome be the infallible interpreter of the Scripture, and whether it belongeth to euery particular person to interpret the same. Sect. 9.	p. 23.
Whether the Church may erre, and whether the Church of Rome hath erre, Sect. 10.	p. 30.
Of the perfection of the Scriptures, and of Traditions, Sect. 13. 14.	p. 40.
The iudgement of the ancient Fathers touching the perfection of the holy Scriptures, Sect. 16.	p. 53.
Of the authority of the Church, and whether she or the Scripture be the Iudge, and whether M. Arnoux hath reason to call the holy Scriptures a dumbe rule, Sect. 19.	p. 57.
Whether the lips of the Priest do infallibly preserve knowledge, Sect. 20.	p. 64.
Of the providence of God, and how God conducteth the actions of the wicked, without being author of sinne, or participating with their vices, Sect. 21.	p. 69.

The Table.

<i>Of free-will, and of naturall corruption, Sect. 22.</i>	p. 78.
<i>Whether man by his free-will can chuse goodnesse, Sect. 26.</i>	p. 85.
<i>Of original sinne after Baptisme, Sect. 29.</i>	p. 89.
<i>Of the imputation of the right conscience of Christ, Sect. 32.</i>	p. 102.
<i>Of humane satisfactions, Sect. 36.</i>	p. 110.
<i>Of superabundant satisfactions, and whether the merits of Christ are applyed unto vs by our satisfactions, Sect. 40.</i>	p. 123.
<i>Of iustification by faith, and what true faith is, Sect. 42.</i>	p. 127.
<i>Of iustification onely by faith, and of the word iustifie, Sect. 43.</i>	p. 132.
<i>How according to Saint Iames, man is iustified by workes, Sect. 44.</i>	p. 136.
<i>Of the certainty of saluation and of perseuerance, Sect. 46.</i>	p. 137.
<i>Whether a man is saved and elected, vpon condition that he shall be- lieue and do good workes, Sect. 47.</i>	p. 142.
<i>Of the feare of the faithfull, and whether it derogateth any thing from the certainty of saluation, Sect. 49.</i>	p. 144.
<i>Of certainty to perseuer, Sect. 50.</i>	p. 147.
<i>Whether faith can be without good workes, Sect. 54.</i>	p. 154.
<i>Of the first and second iustification according to the Church of Rome, Sect. 61.</i>	p. 159.
<i>Of Marius, Sect. 62.</i>	p. 160.
<i>Whether God is debter vnto vs, (as M. Arnoux saith) and of our reward, Sect. 68. 69.</i>	p. 171.
<i>Of workes of supererogation, Sect. 70.</i>	p. 173.
<i>Of the innocation of Saints, Sect. 71.</i>	p. 181.
<i>Whether the Saints vnderstand our prayers, and know all that is done here vpon the earth, Sect. 73.</i>	p. 181.
<i>Whether Iesus Christ be our onely mediator and advocate, Sect. 74.</i>	p. 187.
<i>That the Saints are not our advocates, and that the Church of Rome calleth vpon some Saints that neuer were, and whose holi- nesse is very questionable, Sect. 75.</i>	p. 191.
<i>That the mutuall prayers of the liuing, make nothing for the inno- cation of Saints dead, Sect. 76.</i>	p. 196.
<i>Of the credit of Saints in heauen, Sect. 77.</i>	p. 197.
<i>Proofs of the innocation of Saints by Aristotle, Sect. 78.</i>	p. 199.

The Table.

Confutation of the invocation of Saints by the Scriptures, Sect. 81. p. 201.

Confutation of the places of Scripture alledged for the invocation of Saints, Sect. 82. p. 207.

Of Purgatory, Sect. 84. p. 209.

The description of Purgatorie, Sect. 85. p. 210.

The opinion of the ancient Fathers touching the state of the soules of the faithfull after this life, Sect. 86. p. 214.

Confutation of Purgatorie by the word of God, Sect. 87. p. 220.

Places out of the Fathers against Purgatorie, Sect. 88. p. 230.

Of Pardons, Sect. 89. p. 236.

Of single life, or perpetuall abstinence from marriage, Sect. 90. p. 239.

Of the difference of meates, Sect. 91. p. 253.

Of the word Church, and of the diuerse significations thereof, Sect. 92. p. 262.

Whether the Church be visible, and to whom it is visible, Sect. 93. p. 267.

Of the true markes of the true Church, Sect. 94. p. 268.

Of the false markes of the Church, and of the title Catholicke, the first marke, Sect. 95. p. 272.

Of Antiquitie, the second marke, Sect. 95. p. 273.

Of succession of Chaires, the third marke, Sect. 97. p. 274.

Of perpetuall continuance, the fourth marke, Sect. 98. p. 275.

Of multitude and greatnesse, the fifth marke, Sect. 99. p. 276.

Of miracles, the sixth marke, Sect. 100. p. 277.

Of unity, the seventh marke, Sect. 101. p. 278.

Of the circle in dispensation, Sect. 103. p. 280.

Against of the Church and her markes, Sect. 104. 105. p. 282.

Markes whereby M. Arnoux will haue the true Church to be knowne, Sect. 105. p. 285.

Against of the perpetuities of the Church, Sect. 106. p. 288.

Of Libertinisme and prophane life, Sect. 110. p. 292.

Of Peters supremacie, Sect. 111. p. 295.

Of Peters successors, Sect. 114. p. 299.

Against of the perpetuities of the Church, Sect. 115. p. 301.

Of idolatrie in the Romish Church, and in how many sorts the Church

The Table.

<i>Church of Rome is idolatrous, and what idolatrie is, Sect. 116.</i>	p. 303.
<i>Of the words Image and Idoll, and of the Hebrew words Pasel and Temunah which God useth in the Law, Sect. 117.</i>	p. 305.
<i>Of the Images of God and of the Trinitie, Sect. 118.</i>	p. 307.
<i>Whether it be lawfull to set up pictures and images of Saints that are dead, in the Churches, for helpes and furtherances of pietie and deuotion, Sect. 119.</i>	p. 312.
<i>Of the adoration of Images, and of the seruice which is done vnto them, Sect. 120.</i>	p. 318.
<i>Of the adoration of the crosse, and of the signe of the crosse, Sect. 121.</i>	p. 328.
<i>Of relickes, and of the adoration of them, Sect. 122.</i>	p. 333.
<i>Confutation of the adoration of relickes by the word of God, Sect. 123.</i>	p. 340.
<i>Of the dominion of the Prelates of the Church of Rome, Sect. 124.</i>	p. 344.
<i>Againe of Saint Peters supremacie, Sect. 129.</i>	p. 350.
<i>Of the vocation of Pastors, Sect. 130.</i>	p. 353.
<i>Againe of the perpetuitie and infalliblenesse of the Church of Rome, Sect. 123.</i>	p. 362.
<i>Of Ecclesiasticall policie, Sect. 136.</i>	p. 366.
<i>Of excommunications of the Church of Rome, Sect. 139.</i>	p. 369.

A Table of the matters contained in the second booke.

O <i>f the pretended Sacrament of Confirmation, Sect. 2.</i>	p. 376.
<i>Of the Sacrament of Penance, Sect. 3.</i>	p. 381.
<i>Of Auricular confession, Sect. 4.</i>	p. 386.
<i>Of Absolution and sacramentall satisfaction, Sect. 5.</i>	p. 389.
<i>Of the pretended sacrament of Marriage, Sect. 6.</i>	p. 396.
<i>Of extreme Vnction, Sect. 8.</i>	p. 404.
<i>Of the sacrament of Orders, Sect. 9.</i>	p. 412.
<i>Whether</i>	

The Table.

<i>Whether the order of Priesthood be a sacrament, Sect. 10.</i>	p. 413.
<i>Of the order of Priesthood in the Church of Rome, and of their sacrificing, Sect. 11.</i>	p. 414.
<i>Of the sacrifice of the Masse, Sect. 12.</i>	p. 420.
<i>Reasons which our aduersaries alledge for the sacrifice of the Masse, Sect. 13.</i>	p. 429.
<i>How and in what sence the holy Supper may be called a sacrifice, Sect. 14.</i>	p. 437.
<i>The opinions of the Fathers touching the sacrifice of the Eucharist, Sect. 15.</i>	p. 439.
<i>Of Baptisme and the necessitie thereof, Sect. 16.</i>	p. 444.
<i>The signification of the word Baptisme, Sect. 17.</i>	p. 446.
<i>Of the necessitie in Baptisme of persons that are at yeares of discretion, Sect. 18.</i>	p. 447.
<i>Of the necessitie of Baptisme of little children, Sect. 19.</i>	p. 450.
<i>The deciding of this question by the holy Scriptures, Sect. 20.</i>	p. 453.
<i>The examination of that which our aduersaries produce for the absolute necessitie of Baptisme, Sect. 21.</i>	p. 458.
<i>Of the reall union of the faithfull with Iesus Christ, and of the eating of his body, Sect. 22.</i>	p. 463.
<i>Of the reall presence, and of Transsubstantiation, Sect. 23.</i>	p. 466.
<i>The beleefe of both parts, Sect. 24.</i>	p. 467.
<i>Prooue of the doctrine of our Church by the words of the institution of this sacrament, Sect. 25.</i>	p. 470.
<i>Prooue of the same by the circumstances of the action, Sect. 26.</i>	p. 484.
<i>Other places of Scripture for the same matter, Sect. 27.</i>	p. 487.
<i>A briefe and certaine exposition of these words, This is my body, Sect. 28.</i>	p. 492.
<i>With what libertie our aduersaries forge figures, Sect. 29.</i>	p. 494.
<i>That Transsubstantiation aboliseth the humanitie of Christ, and exposeth it to great opprobrie and disgrace, Sect. 30.</i>	p. 497.
<i>That in the 6. of S. Iohn, there is nothing that maketh for Transsubstantiation, Sect. 31.</i>	p. 502.
<i>That the Masse, and the Decrees, and Glosses of the Church of Rome ouerthrow Transsubstantiation, Sect. 32.</i>	p. 509.
O o 2	Certaine

The Table.

<i>Certain places out of the Fathers concerning this subject, Sect. 33.</i>	
<i>P. 513.</i>	
<i>An answer to the Prosopœia made by M. Arnaux, Sect. 34.</i>	
<i>P. 523.</i>	
<i>Of taking the Cup away from the Laity in the holy Supper, or of the communion under one kind only Sect. 35.</i>	<i>P. 525.</i>
<i>Examination of the adversaries reasons, Sect. 36.</i>	<i>P. 530.</i>
<i>Means of agreement, Sect. 37.</i>	<i>P. 533.</i>
<i>Of the exemption of the Clergie, Sect. 39.</i>	<i>P. 536.</i>
<i>Of the Popes power over the Crowns and lines of Kings, and over all the temporalities of kingdoms, Sect. 40.</i>	<i>P. 551.</i>
<i>That the Popes power over the the Crowns of Kings, and over the temporalities of kingdoms, is contrary to the word of God and reason, Sect. 41.</i>	<i>P. 542.</i>
<i>Whether the power of Kings, Princes, and Magistrates, be ordained by divine Law, or whether it be an humane ordinance, as M. Arnaux alledgeth, Sect. 42.</i>	<i>P. 556.</i>

FINIS.

